

Emergency Active Travel Fund - tranche 2 survey

General

Q1. What is your local transport authority name?

Rutland County Council

Strategic case

Q2. Please set out the context for the bid by briefly explaining the local transport problem, challenge or needs that your bid will help to address. These should be consistent with the objectives of the Fund set out in the bid invitation letter.

During the Covid 19 pandemic, UK residents have begun to rediscover an enthusiasm for walking and cycling – making the most of the quieter roads experienced during lockdown. As we move forward it is vital that we hold on to this momentum and create the infrastructure needed to provide our residents not only with further opportunities for leisure walking and cycling, but also to encourage a gear shift towards these activities as a means of travel.

In order to do this, through our bid we propose to reallocate road space and provide segregated walking and cycling provisions of a suitable width to enable social distancing. In doing so there is also potential to enhance both perceived and actual safety for residents wishing to continue with these activities, now that motorised traffic has begun to increase.

Such infrastructure will also support social distancing, by offering an alternative to local bus services, on which capacity has previously been restricted to ensure the safety of those that have no alternative than to travel by bus. Similarly, by facilitating walking and cycling as a means of travel to school, demand for 'home to school' bus transport may be reduced – helping to better enable social distancing for those using the service.

To ensure the greatest benefit is achieved, our bid focuses on those schemes that have a recognised potential to increase walking and cycling or that offer a direct and efficient travel alternative to key destinations, such as service centres, schools and work places (for example, by following strategic corridors).

Through the schemes identified within our bid, not only would we be providing an urgent response to Covid 19 – by enabling social distancing on bus services, but we will be supporting our residents to live healthier, more active lifestyles, whilst reducing local congestion and our impact on the environment. Furthermore, such provisions have the opportunity to support the economic recovery of our tourism and leisure industry, hit by the impact of Covid 19.

In light of the need to expedite these routes as quickly as possible, to assist with social distancing, this bid primarily focuses on two schemes that could be delivered by the end of the financial year. Our bid also outlines 3 further schemes, which due to scale and cost are unlikely to be completed in the timescales available, but which scored highly and would have long term benefits.

When developing the proposed schemes outlined in this bid, it should be noted that the proposals will all be designed in accordance with the standards set out in the new Local Transport Note 1/20: Cycle Infrastructure Design Guidance. Schemes will also be subject to an equality and diversity impact screening assessment, alongside consultation with access and local disability groups, thus ensuring measures cater for and are not detrimental to individuals with protected characteristics.

Integration with existing Council policies and plans

Whilst the routes in this bid would support our response to Covid 19, they also help to deliver on the priorities set out in our draft LCWIP, which in turn align with the overarching objectives of our fourth local transport plan.

The draft LCWIP priorities that have a level of overlap with the objectives of the Emergency Active Travel Fund – Tranche 2 include:

- Improving road safety
- Promoting healthier travel options by providing walking and cycling infrastructure that supports education and employment sites.
- Tackling rural isolation by providing access to services (helping to reduce congestion and the environmental impact of motorised transport).
- Improving access to tourism destinations.

To ensure that any infrastructure resulting from this bid fully aligns with the priorities of our LCWIP and LTP4, when considering routes we also factored in our remaining draft LCWIP priorities:

- Supporting future housing growth with sustainable travel alternatives.
- Improving connectivity of infrastructure.

Q3. Please provide a summary of the proposed scheme(s). For example, locations, measures to be adopted, and whether they are temporary or permanent measures. Please explain how the scheme(s) will help to address the local challenges you have set out above, consistent with the objectives of the Fund. This should include how you have considered any mitigating impacts on other transport modes.

Through our prioritisation process the following 5 routes were identified as scoring highly against both the grant objectives and that of our draft LCWIP:

- Scheme 1 - Ayston Road, Uppingham (from A47 roundabout towards town centre).
- Scheme 2 - Burley Road, Oakham (from junction with Ashwell Road to the A606 Burley Park Way roundabout).
- Scheme 3 - Egleton turn to Manton bridge
- Scheme 4 - Enhancements to existing cycleway footway on the A6121, Ketton - approximately between Chater Lodge and The Gate Lodge. Plus Tinwell to Stamford.
- Scheme 5 - Stamford towards Empingham (via Stamford Road).

Whilst all of the schemes above scored highly and would deliver significant benefit, this bid focuses on schemes 1 and 2 as they are most capable of being delivered within the timescales available.

For both Ayston Road, Uppingham and Burley Road, Oakham we propose a permanent, lightly segregated cycleway provision that brings both residents and tourists from the outskirts into our town centres. It is currently proposed that the route would run alongside a parallel footway provision.

In order to deliver these schemes we would need to consider repositioning highway furniture such as bus shelters and signage as well as road realignment in some areas.

We would provide route marking and install cycle and pedestrian count monitors (subject to available funding) on the above two routes.

Schemes 3 to 5 would offer a segregated cycleway provision between the settlements listed. However, due to our county's rural nature, the distance that these routes would span make these schemes cost prohibitive at present, however we have included these routes within our bid to identify our future aspiration.

By taking forward schemes 1 and 2 we hope to address the challenges brought about through Covid 19, whilst providing the following benefits:

- Enhanced perceived and actual safety for both pedestrians and cyclists – provided through a lightly segregated route that separates both cyclists and pedestrians from not only motorised vehicles, but each other.
- Further enabling social distancing on both our local buses and scholar services by offering alternative transport means along bus routes (making bus user journeys more pleasant).
- Provide provisions that are accessible for all and that aren't detrimental to those with protected characteristics. This will be achieved by ensuring LTN 1/20 guidance is used when constructing all schemes and offering light segregation.
- In addition to the above, it is also felt that schemes 1 and 2 would help with economic recovery by supporting our tourist, shopping and leisure industries impacted by Covid 19.

Q4. What prioritisation has been undertaken to identify these proposed scheme(s)? Please tick all that apply

Scheme(s) identified in Local Cycling and Walking Investment Plan (LCWIP)

Scheme(s) identified by the Rapid Cycleway Prioritisation Tool (<https://www.cyipt.bike/rapid/>)

Scheme(s) identified through consultation with stakeholders

Other (please specify):

Routes put forward within this bid were initially identified from parish and ward member requests and the findings of the Rapid Cycleway Prioritisation Tool. These requests then underwent prioritisation as follows: Stage 1 – Screening: Routes were checked to ensure that they met the following criteria (aligning with the bid objectives) by offering: • both walking and cycling opportunities • a segregated provision • significant change to the current situation Routes that didn't meet the above criteria were excluded from further consideration. Stage 2 – Scoring: A scoring system was then identified, which allocated points based on whether a route: • Was identified within the Rapid cycleway prioritisation tool as a 'top route'. • Was identified within the Rapid cycleway prioritisation tool as a 'cohesive route'. • Is one of the top 15 routes identified in our initial work on our draft LCWIP. • Offers an alternative to an existing bus route. • Could assist with economic recovery. • Offers access to education. • Offers access to services and employment. • Offers potential safety enhancements (based on cycle and pedestrian 'KSI' and 'slight' accident data). • Has local political support or has been strategically identified. • Has public support. • Could support future population changes associated with housing growth. Routes were then ranked based on their score, with the top 5 schemes progressing on to the final stage. Stage 3 - Sense checks: From stage two, the top 5 routes were sense checked and further prioritised by considering: • Cycling and walking potential (using data where available). • Whether the route offers a useful route, ideally linking with existing parts of the network to enhance connectivity. • The cost and time required to deliver the scheme.

LCWIPs

Q5. Which LCWIP does the scheme(s) fall under?

Rutland County Council draft LCWIP. Our LCWIP is still in development, however, the results of some initial prioritisation work carried out as part of the LCWIP process, have helped steer our decision making for this bid.

Q6. Please provide a URL to the LCWIP if available

Not yet available.

Scheme 1

Q7. Scheme name

Ayston Road, Uppingham

Q8. Total scheme cost (£)

£242,208 - based on a figure of £240/metre for light segregation schemes (as set out in a report to the Department for Transport, January 2017, by Transport for Quality of Life Ltd) + 20% contingency.

Q9. Please provide a clear description of the scheme, including :• the location of new cycle lanes proposed to be introduced;• types of road that they are located on;• the location of any junction improvements and point closures; • the location of any area-wide measures such as school streets, point closures or modal filters; • whether interventions are temporary or permanent.If possible, a map should be emailed separately to Walking.Cycling@dft.gov.uk.

Location: Ayston Road (A6003), Uppingham. From the A47 roundabout towards the town centre.

Road: The A6003 (Ayston Road) is a single carriageway, urban road that links the outskirts of Uppingham to the town centre. The road has a 30mph speed limit and offers both a strategic link through to Corby, as well as residential and town centre access. Two cycleway provisions link up to the starting point of the proposed new route.

Scheme: A permanent, segregated cycleway (light segregation due to cost implication) alongside the existing footway (to be widened where necessary). Additional works include: short section of road realignment near Wheatley Avenue (to get consistent route) and conversion of existing crossings to a toucan with advance stop lines. Suitable markings will be provided, along with a cycle/ pedestrian counter (subject to funding).

Location map to be emailed separately.

Q10. What measures are included in your proposed scheme(s)? Please select all that apply. Please note that for all measures, appropriate access for freight deliveries, bus routes, taxis and disabled people needs to be appropriately considered.

New segregated cycleway (permanent)

Widening existing footway

Provision for monitoring and evaluation of schemes

Q11. For corridor schemes, please provide the route length in miles

0.52 miles (841 metres)

Q12. For area-wide schemes, please provide the number of units proposed (e.g. no. of junction improvements)

NA

Scheme 2

Q13. Scheme name

Burley Road, Oakham

Q14. Total scheme cost (£)

£192, 960 - based on a figure of £240/metre for light segregation schemes (as set out in a report to the Department for Transport, January 2017, by Transport for Quality of Life Ltd) + 20% contingency

Q15. Please provide a clear description of the scheme, including :• the location of new cycle lanes proposed to be introduced;• types of road that they are located on;• the location of any junction improvements and point closures; • the location of any area-wide measures such as school streets, point closures or modal filters; • whether interventions are temporary or permanent.If possible, a map should be emailed separately to Walking.Cycling@dft.gov.uk.

Location: Burley Road (B668), Oakham. Along Burley Road from the junction with Ashwell Road to the A606 Burley Park Way roundabout.

Road: The B668 is a single carriageway, urban road that links the outskirts of Oakham towards the town centre. The speed limit is primarily 30mph with a short section of 20mph (school time only) and is used by through traffic and for residential and town access. Cycleway provision on the bypass (Burley Park Way) would connect to the starting point of this proposed route.

Scheme: A permanent segregated cycleway (light segregation due to cost implication) running alongside the existing footway (to be widened where necessary). Additional works include: realignment of lay by, relocation of bus shelter, signs and poles, and conversion of existing crossing to a toucan with advanced stop line. Suitable markings will be provided, along with a cycle/ pedestrian counter (subject to funding).

Map to be emailed separately.

Q16. What measures are included in your proposed scheme(s)? Please select all that apply. Please note that for all measures, appropriate access for freight deliveries, bus routes, taxis and disabled people needs to be appropriately considered.

New segregated cycleway (permanent)

Widening existing footway

Provision for monitoring and evaluation of schemes

Q17. For corridor schemes, please provide the route length in miles

0.42 miles (670 metres)

Q18. For area-wide schemes, please provide the number of units proposed (e.g. no. of junction improvements)

NA

Scheme 3

Q19. Scheme name

Ketton and Tinwell to Stamford

Q20. Total scheme cost (£)

£334, 656 - based on a figure of £240/metre for light segregation schemes (as set out in a report to the Department for Transport, January 2017, by Transport for Quality of Life Ltd) + 20% contingency. Cost excludes any road realignment required.

Q21. Please provide a clear description of the scheme, including :• the location of new cycle lanes proposed to be introduced;• types of road that they are located on;• the location of any junction improvements and point closures; • the location of any area-wide measures such as school streets, point closures or modal filters; • whether interventions are temporary or permanent.If possible, a map should be emailed separately to Walking.Cycling@dft.gov.uk.

Location: Eastern section of High Street (A6121), Ketton - approximately between Chater Lodge and The Gate Lodge. Then along Main Street (A6121) from Tinwell to Stamford.

Road: The A6121 provides both a strategic route towards Stamford as well as residential access to those in Ketton and Tinwell. The road is single carriageway and the speed limit varies between 30mph within the villages and 60mph on the rural stretches. The proposal would both enhance the existing provision and extend it towards Stamford.

Scheme: Upgrade existing section of joint cycleway footway to the eastern edge of Ketton, on the A6121 (High Street). Provision of permanent segregated cycleway within Tinwell through to Stamford. Significant road realignment would be needed in parts to enable suitable widths. Suitable markings would be provided, along with a cycle/ pedestrian counter (subject to funding).

Map to be emailed separately.

Q22. What measures are included in your proposed scheme(s)? Please select all that apply. Please note that for all measures, appropriate access for freight deliveries, bus routes, taxis and disabled people needs to be appropriately considered.

New segregated cycleway (permanent)

Widening existing footway

Provision for monitoring and evaluation of schemes

Q23. For corridor schemes, please provide the route length in miles

0.73 miles (1162 metres)

Q24. For area-wide schemes, please provide the number of units proposed (e.g. no. of junction improvements)

NA

Scheme 4

Q25. Scheme name

Stamford to Empingham

Q26. Total scheme cost (£)

£1, 725,408 - based on a figure of £240/metre for light segregation schemes (set out in a report to the Department for Transport, January 2017, by Transport for Quality of Life Ltd) + 20% contingency. Cost excludes any road realignment required.

Q27. Please provide a clear description of the scheme, including :• the location of new cycle lanes proposed to be introduced;• types of road that they are located on;• the location of any junction improvements and point closures; • the location of any area-wide measures such as school streets, point closures or modal filters; • whether interventions are temporary or permanent.If possible, a map should be emailed separately to Walking.Cycling@dft.gov.uk.

Location: Empingham to Stamford via Stamford Road, A606.

Road: The A606 is a rural, single carriageway providing a strategic route between Empingham and Stamford. The road has a 60mph limit and currently has grass verges to both sides.

Scheme: New segregated cycleway (in verge) between Empingham and Stamford. Significant road realignment would be needed in parts to enable suitable widths. Suitable markings would be provided, along with a cycle counter (subject to funding).

Map to be emailed separately.

Q28. What measures are included in your proposed scheme(s)? Please select all that apply. Please note that for all measures, appropriate access for freight deliveries, bus routes, taxis and disabled people needs to be appropriately considered.

New segregated cycleway (permanent)

Provision for monitoring and evaluation of schemes

Q29. For corridor schemes, please provide the route length in miles

3.72 miles (5991 metres)

Q30. For area-wide schemes, please provide the number of units proposed (e.g. no. of junction improvements)

NA

Scheme 5

Q31. Scheme name

Egleton turn to Manton bridge

Q32. Total scheme cost (£)

£641,376 - based on a figure of £240/metre for light segregation schemes (as set out in a report to the Department for Transport, January 2017, by Transport for Quality of Life Ltd) + 20% contingency. Figure does not include the cost of any required road realignment.

Q33. Please provide a clear description of the scheme, including :• the location of new cycle lanes proposed to be introduced;• types of road that they are located on;• the location of any junction improvements and point closures; • the location of any area-wide measures such as school streets, point closures or modal filters; • whether interventions are temporary or permanent.If possible, a map should be emailed separately to Walking.Cycling@dft.gov.uk.

Location: Egleton turn to Manton bridge - along the A6003 between the junction with Hambleton Road to the existing provision which starts at the River Gwash.

Road: The route runs along the A6003, a strategic, single carriageway route with a 50mph limit. The proposed route would connect at both ends to existing cycleway provisions.

Scheme: New segregated cycle way (in verge). Significant road realignment would be needed in parts to enable suitable widths. Suitable markings would be provided, along with a cycle counter (subject to funding).

Map to be emailed separately.

Q34. What measures are included in your proposed scheme(s)? Please select all that apply. Please note that for all measures, appropriate access for freight deliveries, bus routes, taxis and disabled people needs to be appropriately considered.

New segregated cycleway (permanent)

Provision for monitoring and evaluation of schemes

Q35. For corridor schemes, please provide the route length in miles

1.38 miles (2227 metres)

Q36. For area-wide schemes, please provide the number of units proposed (e.g. no. of junction improvements)

NA

Finance case

Q37. Total DfT funding sought (£)

£435,168 for schemes 1 and 2. We appreciate this is above the indicative allocation, however the requested amount would enable us to deliver high quality, meaningful routes that would provide significant enhancements.

Q38. Total DfT capital funding sought (£)

£435,168 for schemes 1 and 2.

Q39. Total DfT revenue funding sought (£)

£0

Q40. Total local authority contribution, if applicable, (£)

Officer time will be provided. A capital monetary contribution will also be considered, dependent on the value of any grant received.

Management case

Q41. When do you expect to commence construction? (DD/MM/YY)

Upon notification of grant funding allocation - ideally no later than 31/10/2020.

Q42. When do you expect to have completed the work? (DD/MM/YY)

No later than 31/03/2021.

Q43. Please describe the project review and governance arrangements in place, and any assurance arrangements, e.g. to ensure that accessibility requirements will be met

Due to the current workloads created by the pandemic, a separate project board won't be established. However, it is felt that a proportionate response would be for our existing 'Reopening Market Towns' group (set up in response to the Covid 19 pandemic) to be utilised for decision making, to steer the work required to deliver tranche 2 infrastructure projects and review progress. This group consists of senior managers from within the Council, along with delivery partners. To progress any routes emerging from our Tranche 2 bid, we would then be able to invite key stakeholders, political members and delivery partners to the meeting as required – reducing impact on staff resources.

Updates will also be provided to the Council's Highway and Transport Working Group – however the frequency of this groups meetings (quarterly) make it an unsuitable alternative to act as a project board, hence utilising the 'Reopening Market Towns' group.

To ensure the efficient and quick delivery of successful schemes, a designated project team will however be established – consisting of:

- Senior responsible owner: Head of Service for Transport and Highways,
- Project Manager: Transport Strategy Manager,
- Sustainable transport officer,
- Development Control and Planning Policy representatives,
- Highway representatives,
- Environmental services representative (for impact of verges),
- Our current Highway contractor, and
- Other identified delivery partners.

It should also be noted that an equality and diversity impact screening assessment will take place for each of the schemes, to ensure that they cater for and don't negatively impact residents or route users with protected characteristics. This assessment would include consideration of accessibility for those with a disability or restricted mobility. As set out in our response to Q39, we will also actively engage with accessibility groups within the county to ensure routes are as accessible as possible and review any concerns.

Q44. Please indicate what community engagement will be undertaken as part of the scheme development and that stakeholders have been consulted on matters such as accessibility issues, impacts on local businesses, freight deliveries and bus and taxi operators

When identifying routes, consideration was given to those proposals that have previously been raised to us by local parish councils or ward members. As such, for these schemes we know there is existing political support locally. In addition, when prioritizing schemes we took into consideration any support identified on 'Widen my Path' and in our Countywide Travel Survey (which took place in 2016) – again, indicating a level of public support for some of the schemes.

However, to progress the proposals further and prior to any works, we will undertake further, clear and accessible communication and engagement with the following groups throughout the process – outlining proposals and discussing any concerns regarding the overall scheme or works required to deliver it:

- Landowners – with regards to land purchase (if required) and/ or vegetation maintenance alongside proposed routes.
- Local MP, parish councils and ward members – to ensure the proposal is politically supported. It should be noted that our MP, Alicia Kearns is supportive of the need to promote and facilitate active travel, walking and cycling within Rutland.
- Members of the public – to raise awareness.
- Existing route users (including pedestrians, cyclists, bus operators, taxi and freight providers) – to gather feedback on areas for improvement or concern.
- Stakeholder and interest groups (such as local cycling walking and cycling groups) – to identify any areas of concern or specific enhancements required along the route.
- Accessibility groups – to identify and address any issues that may act as an accessibility barrier.
- Other delivery partners (including, but not limited to, adjoining LAs where a route may have an impact).
- Residents and businesses along the route – to raise awareness of the proposal and answer any concerns.
- Internal departments within RCC – to ensure the swift implementation of schemes (if funding is granted) and ongoing maintenance of the provisions.
- Our LEP and sub national transport body - Midlands Connect.
- Emergency services where required.

After submitting this bid, we will prepare a communication plan, setting out in more detail, who we will communicate with, when and by what means.

Q45. Please state which design standards have been followed in developing your scheme(s)

The proposed schemes will undergo design in accordance with the new Local Transport Note 1/20: Cycle Infrastructure Design Guidance.

Q46. Consultancy spend should be limited and where needed, existing framework contractors should be used. Are you intending to use consultants?

No

If yes, please provide details

NA

Commercial case

Q47. Is the authority ready to commence work and, if applicable, are contractors/ procurement / delivery partners in place?

Yes

Please provide details

Design work and consultation will be carried out during August and September, prior to work starting.

The Council's contractor has been alerted to the potential work and have confirmed they will have teams available to deliver these projects between autumn and the end of this financial year.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Q48. Has monitoring and evaluation been considered for all scheme(s)?

Yes

If yes please provide details

The following monitoring and evaluation is proposed for the 5 schemes put forward.

Subject to receiving grant funding (and prior to work commencing), a more detailed monitoring plan will be prepared, setting out monitoring and evaluation time frames, roles and responsibilities.

The overarching outcomes that we hope to achieve through the creation of these routes are:

- Increased walking and cycling levels
- The provision of socially distanced alternatives to passenger transport
- Improved actual and perceived cyclist and pedestrian safety
- Increased numbers of individuals walking/ cycling to work and school.

Other benefits will include; improved health, reduced car use and improved accessibility.

The scheme outputs will be monitored continuously during the first 12 months to identify progress against desired outcomes. Data for monitoring and evaluation will likely be gathered using the following methods:

- Cyclist and pedestrian numbers: ideally via automatic counters (subject to funding) or manual counts. Cycle parking counts may also be used.
- General mode of travel: route user, stakeholder and focus group surveys.
- Number of cyclist and pedestrian collisions: Stats19 collision data.
- Perception of safety: route user, stakeholder and focus group surveys.
- Number of pupils walking or cycling to school: school travel surveys.
- Number of individuals walking or cycling to work: workplace travel surveys.

Q49. Using the monitoring and evaluation guidance provided, please outline briefly how you will monitor and evaluate each permanent scheme costing at least £2m. (If no individual scheme is expected to cost over £2m, please state "not applicable")

Not applicable.

Declaration

Q50. Reporting Officer details

Name	Heather Caldicott
Telephone number	01572 758205
Email address	hcaldicott@rutland.gov.uk

Q51. Senior Responsible Officer details

Name	Moaz Khan
Telephone number	01572 758342
Email address	mkhan@rutland.gov.uk

Q52. Section 151 Officer (or equivalent) details

Name	Saverio Della Rocca
Telephone number	01572 758159
Email address	sdrocca@Rutland.gov.uk

Q53. Please add further details or clarification

Unfortunately the existing cycle route data used in the Rapid Cycleway Prioritisation Tool, doesn't reflect the current position in Rutland - this is a matter we will look to address.

In light of the above, when viewing our bid, please bear in mind that the following 'top routes' identified within the Rapid Cycleway Prioritisation Tool have already been constructed and as such have not been put forward for consideration:

Rank 1 - Oakham Road, A606
Rank 3 - A606, A606
Rank 6 - Burley Park Way, A606
Rank 8 - Uppingham Road, A6003

Furthermore, sections of the 'cohesive routes' identified within the tool have also been created, where this is the case they have not been considered under this bid.