



XX June 2007

Dear XXXX

**London Cycle Network Plus (LCN+)
Cycle Route Implementation and Stakeholder Plan (CRISP)
Review of a Sample of Final CRISP Reports**

To promote the continuous improvement of the CRISP process, TfL commissioned a review of a selection of LCN+ Final CRISP reports for adherence to the CRISP generic brief. The CRISP reports reviewed reflect a range of location, date, route characteristics and organisations undertaking CRISP studies.

The primary finding of the review is that the greatest value is obtained from the CRISP process by closely following the TfL generic CRISP brief. However, we note that there are variations in adherence to the brief that have had an impact on the value of individual reports.

TfL has prepared a response to the review which identifies specific matters arising. These matters are drawn to the attention of authorities commissioning CRISP studies.

The review and the TfL Response are posted on the Cycling publications section of the TfL website (www.tfl.gov.uk).

Subsequent to this review, a study to assess the quality and benefits of constructed schemes originating from CRISP study recommendations is planned by TfL in 2007.

If you have any enquiries regarding this report or any aspect of the CRISP process please contact Nick Chitty, in the Directorate of Road Network Performance at TfL (nick.chitty@tfl.gov.uk).

Yours sincerely

Nick Morris
Director Road Network Performance &
TfL's Traffic Manager

Project:

**TfL Response to a Review of a sample of
Final CRISP Reports for compliance with
the CRISP brief**

Status: Final
Version: 01
Date: 05 June 2007



Table of Contents

0.	Document Control	2
1.	Summary	3
2.	Introduction and Context	4-5
3.	Review and Report	6
4.	Primary Findings	6
5.	Key Matters Arising	7-8
6.	Supplementary Matters Arising	9-10
7.	Revision to CRISP Generic Brief	11

0. DOCUMENT CONTROL

0.1 Author(s)

Nick Chitty, Principal Transport Planner, Transport for London

0.2 Document Summary

This document is for Project:

London Cycle Network Plus (LCN+)

TfL Response to a Review of a sample of

Final CRISP Reports for compliance with the CRISP brief

0.3 Document History

Version	Date	Changes since previous issue
01	5 June 2007	Final

0.4 Reference Documents

The London Cycling Action Plan (LCAP), TfL, February 2004

Capita Symonds Report:

**Review of a sample of Final CRISP Reports for
Compliance with the CRISP brief**

Document Reference CS 03669-03/D/12B

0.5 Distribution

Commissioning Authorities

LCN+ Steering Group

LCAP Monitoring and Review Group

TfL Website

LCN+ Website

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1** The London Cycling Action Plan (LCAP) (TfL, 2004) sets out the need for clear guidance and procedures for assessing LCN+ routes and implementing improvements, with appropriate stakeholder involvement. The Cycle Route Implementation and Stakeholder Plan (CRISP) process was developed by TfL to satisfy these objectives.
- 1.2** To inform the continuous improvement of the CRISP process TfL commissioned a review of a selection of LCN+ Final CRISP reports. The reports were chosen to reflect a range of location, date, route type and organisations undertaking CRISP studies.
- 1.3** The review of Final CRISP reports has demonstrated that the CRISP process is being delivered according to defined processes.
- 1.4** While the primary finding is that the greatest value is obtained from the CRISP process by closely following the TfL generic CRISP brief, it is noted that there are significant differences in the rigorousness of application of the brief which has had an impact on the value of individual reports.
- 1.5** Some specific improvements have been suggested and this document sets out TfL's response.

Subject to the agreement of LCN+ partner organisations examples of best practice drawn from this review will be published alongside existing examples of good practice on the London Cycle Network website.

2. INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

- 2.1** The CRISP process was developed by TfL in close liaison with the London boroughs, cycle user groups and the LCN+ project management team at LB Camden.
- 2.2** Previously, cycling schemes had been developed in isolation, driven by narrow and local objectives. A significant proportion of schemes failed to progress through committee, or lacked the support of local cyclists or failed to deliver any recognisable benefit.
- 2.3** A key aim therefore was to provide a comprehensive and accurate overview of the whole LCN+ corridor through a clear and consistent process for data gathering, stakeholder engagement, appraisal, optioneering, and programme planning. This requires extensive and comprehensive engagement and consultation with stakeholders.
- 2.4** Equally important was the need to create an environment for people with cycling expertise, local knowledge, and often widely diverging perspectives, to work together to identify common issues, concerns and priorities for the strategic cycling corridors (LCN+) and, specifically to engage in a practical process which would result in agreement on preferred route alignment and link treatment and next steps.
- 2.5** Following a pilot study and consultation on a draft generic brief, a final generic brief was issued in May 2004. Drawing on experience and stakeholder feedback, the generic brief was revised and re-issued as Version 2 in July 2005.
- 2.6** Since then, the CRISP process has been widely supported and adopted by highway authorities across London. The recommendations from CRISP studies are now the primary generator of schemes in the LCN+ programme. The CRISP approach, combining feasibility and consultation from the outset, is also being used on non-LCN+ sections of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) and is being adapted to underpin the Cycling on Greenways programme.

- 2.7** The benefits of having a single defined and inclusive procedure for cycle route development are evident. All 33 London boroughs are now committed to implementing the LCN+. At local level, with a much better understanding of what different people have to contribute – even when they disagree - all parties have been empowered and very few schemes get rejected. There is also a much greater appreciation of the value of cycling and of LCN+ within local communities. Cycle group representatives know what to expect in terms of their involvement and the report output. For strategic planning, CRISP studies have been invaluable in estimating costs to complete the network as well as providing an information source for the LCN+ High Risk Barriers (Infrastructure) Report, published in January 2007.
- 2.8** CRISP is the first part of a process leading to a scheme. Further consultation on schemes through established processes will take place as they are developed into detailed design.
- 2.9** Following this review, a study to identify the quality and benefits of constructed schemes that have originated from CRISP study recommendations is planned by TfL in 2007.

3. THE REVIEW AND REPORT

- 3.1** The review has been carried out by consultant Capita Symonds and is planned to be available on the TfL website www.TfL.gov.uk.
- 3.2** The review report and this TfL response is commended to those in the supply chain for the LCN+ project as well as those involved in CRISP or equivalent studies on the Transport for London Road Network and the TfL Cycling on Greenways programme.

4. PRIMARY FINDINGS

- 4.1** The principal conclusion arising from the review is that the existing generic CRISP brief is sound and that the best reports were those that most closely followed the brief.
- 4.2** The review found that CRISP studies are reasonably following the defined CRISP process and are providing Final CRISP reports that can be used for appraisal, planning, decision making, delivery and promotion of LCN+ Links.
- 4.3** The review also shows that the CRISP study process is facilitating the engagement of a wide range of local stakeholders in the planning and development of cycle routes which they may use, or may affect them, or those that they represent.
- 4.4** The review findings are positive and re-affirm the value of the CRISP process.
- 4.5** Some matters were identified that need to be directed to the commissioning authorities, and consultants and London borough in-house teams that undertake the studies.

5. KEY MATTERS ARISING

5.1 Adherence to CRISP Brief

Reports that adhere closely to the requirements of the brief were measurably more useful.

The review notes the importance of the specified drawings for the presentation and understanding of information pertaining to the study. However, in some of the reports reviewed the large drawings in particular were noted as deviating from the brief.

Attention is drawn to paragraphs 4.26 – 4.31 in the review, where required practice is identified.

Action: Adhere to the requirements of the CRISP brief and take account of matters raised in paragraphs 4.26 – 4.31 in the review, in the preparation of drawings.

5.2 Stakeholder Input - general

Valuable stakeholder input to the reports was identified. The CRISP brief emphasises the need to record stakeholder input and this generally has been found to be the case. The value of the Record of CRIM being carefully summarised and structured is emphasised in the review.

However, the review did find that comments regarding non-compliance of the report to the brief that were made by the LCN+ PM Team were not always acted upon.

To maximise the value of the CRISP process, it is important that the input provided by all stakeholders is accurately and concisely recorded and identified within the report. Reasons are to be given where a suggestion is not adopted.

Stakeholders should note that the CRISP study is the identification and initiation stage of a scheme and that further consultation will take place as schemes that have been recommended in CRISP studies move through design stages towards implementation.

Action: Ensure that relevant stakeholder input is captured, concisely recorded and reflected in the CRISP process and report.

Action: Schedule of minor matters in each Section/Element of the Link identified during Stage 1 and 2 that are not included elsewhere in the report should be recorded in Appendix D of the CRISP Report (in accordance with Annex 1 of the CRISP Brief)

5.3 Stakeholder Input - route alignment

The review states that it appears that stakeholder suggestions for route deviations were not accepted in some cases, without reasons being given.

This goes against the CRISP brief and the spirit of the CRISP process.

The review also mentions confusion among stakeholders regarding the term - 'alternative' route.

From the processing of a number of route variations, TfL is satisfied that the optimisation of LCN+ Link alignment is being successfully addressed by the CRISP process.

Action: Where relevant alignment suggestions are considered and not accepted, reasons should be recorded in the CRISP report.

Action: TfL to issue guidance and clarification on 'alternative' routes.

5.4 Report writing and document control

The review notes that there is room for improvement in document presentation and control. Use of a cover sheet/fly-sheet, report history and contents page are recommended.

TfL supports these suggestions. These are examples of good practice in the quality management of documents.

To address the variable quality in report assembly, the review suggests that training in presentation and report writing skills is required. TfL considers that employment of staff with an appropriate level of competence, and staff training, is the responsibility of organisations commissioning and undertaking studies of this nature.

TfL are currently reviewing the assessment of competencies of consultants who may be commissioned on TfL funded cycling schemes.

Action: Commissioning authorities to require and monitor quality in document preparation.

6. SUPPLEMENTARY MATTERS ARISING

6.1 Link and Route Numbers

The review draws attention to the confusing use of LCN+ Link numbers and LCN Route numbers. Commissioning authorities should ensure that numbering is correct (LCN+ Project Management team at LB Camden can advise) before being presented in correspondence with stakeholders and the pre-CRIM report.

Reference should be made to:

- LCDS paragraph 1.4 regarding network descriptions
- CRISP Supplementary Guidance (available on the LCN+ web-site) for an explanation of LCN+ Link numbering.

The LCN+ Link number shall be the default reference for LCN+ CRISP reports and associated correspondence.

Action: Commissioning authorities to ensure correct link number is used in all CRISP documents and related correspondence.

6.2 Programme for completion of the CRISP study

The review notes that production of the CRISP reports reviewed took significantly longer than the timescales in the indicative programme (Annex 5 of the CRISP generic brief).

While reasonable adherence to the indicative programme should be the target for the commissioning authority, the brief is flexible in that agreement of a programme between the Authority and consultant is allowed for. The key objective should be timely progression of the study, such that the interest and commitment of stakeholders is maintained, and the Final CRISP Report is current.

Note that the effect of reports taking longer to produce than indicated in the brief is not in itself having an adverse effect on the overall programme for CRISP studies. The programme is on-target to be substantially completed by the end of 2007, ahead of the 2008 target in the London Cycling Action Plan (LCAP).

Action: No action

6.3 Use of TfL London Cycle Guide Maps

The London Cycle Guides provide a widely recognised and accepted format for putting a route in its wider local context. The review notes that extracts from the London Cycle Guide maps were not used in the reports reviewed.

It should be noted however, that the CRISP brief requires the routes on the London Cycle Guide maps to be represented on the drawings in CRISP reports. If this is done (the evidence is that it generally is) the need for extracts of the LCG maps becomes less important.

It should also be noted that all London Cycle Guide routes are designated as being of at least medium strategic importance in terms of contribution to a better cycling environment and sustained growth in cycling.

The London Cycle Guide routes have recently been reviewed and cycle facility information recorded. It is anticipated that this information will be available to London authorities in Summer 2007.

Annex 1 of the CRISP brief (version 2) suggests that reports could include an extract of the London Cycle Guide map marked with the route to be studied.

Action: No action

7. REVISION TO CRISP GENERIC BRIEF

- 7.1** Appendix C of the review includes suggested changes to the CRISP brief and Annex 1 of the CRISP generic brief.
- 7.2** It is planned to continue to use the current Generic CRISP brief for the remaining LCN+ CRISP programme referencing this report as a statement of additional requirements. For subsequent programmes it is planned that these matters will be incorporated in development of CRISP briefs specific to those programmes.
- 7.3** Until any such revised version is issued, Version 2 of the CRISP brief and Annex 1 should be used, taking account of the matters arising referred to above.