

CAPITA SYMONDS

Transport for London
Directorate of Road Network Performance

Review of a sample of Final
CRISP reports for compliance
with the CRISP Brief

Capita Symonds Ltd
24-30 Holborn
London
EC1N 2LX

Tel: 020 7870 9300
Fax: 020 7870 9399

Document ref: CS 03669-03/D/12B

9 March 2007

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

- 1 Transport for London (TfL) is undertaking the planning and delivery of a 900km strategic network of cycle routes, called the London Cycle Network Plus (LCN+). Consultation on the LCN+ network was carried out in 2002, and the target year for completion is 2009/10. Funding for LCN+ schemes is provided to boroughs and TfL Area Teams. Programme management of schemes on borough roads is being lead by a dedicated team at the London Borough of Camden.
- 2 The London Cycling Action Plan (TfL, 2004) sets out the need for clear guidance and procedures for assessing LCN+ routes and implementing improvements, with appropriate stakeholder input. To satisfy these objectives, TfL developed the Cycle Route Implementation and Stakeholder Plan (CRISP) process. The principal output of the feasibility study for each Link in the LCN+ network will be a CRISP report.
- 3 In order to assess the quality of CRISP reports produced so far, TfL have commissioned Capita Symonds to review a sample of these reports. This report gives the conclusions of that review. The objectives were to check the extent to which the reports are meeting the requirements of the generic CRISP brief, and to make recommendations on how the process could be improved.
- 4 Whilst the review will inform the continuous improvement of the CRISP process, it also addresses one of the actions in the TfL response to the scrutiny of the LCN+ project by the Greater London Authority (GLA) in 2005.

Report structure and methodology

- 5 The review covered ten CRISP reports, some prepared by consultants and others by in-house borough teams. The first part of the review summarises the results of a comparison of each CRISP report with the requirements of the specification for that report. This was done using an agreed standard list of questions, a copy of which is appended to the review.
- 6 The next part of the review considers the CRISP reports from the stakeholders' perspective, to see how easily and effectively the stakeholders had been able to contribute. This is followed by a number of suggestions as to how future CRISP reports could be improved. The suggestions are in themselves generally minor, but collectively their adoption should have a useful effect. Finally, the conclusions of the review are summarised.
- 7 The appendices to the review also include the first two versions of the generic CRISP brief, and a draft third version containing a number of suggested minor changes prompted by the review.

Principal conclusions of the review

- 8 The CRISP reports reviewed all adhered to the spirit of the CRISP brief. They adhered to the letter of the brief to greater or lesser extent, with those that more closely followed the letter of the brief being the easier to follow.
- 9 Similarly, the reviewed reports generally followed the Document Specification in Annex 1 to the brief, but again those reports that departed most from the detailed requirements tended to be the hardest to follow. The most important area where improvement is needed is in the quality of the drawings.
- 10 All the reviewed reports indicated significant stakeholder input. Although these inputs generally appeared to be well recorded, in one or two instances it appeared that stakeholders' suggestions for route deviations had not been accepted, but without the reasons being stated. It is important that this should not happen in future reports.
- 11 The studies generally took good account of the London Cycling Design Standards when considering strategy and treatment options. However in certain cases insufficient attention was given to the need to consider possible alternatives (LCDS paragraph 2.2.12).
- 12 There was room for improvement in document control in many of the reviewed reports. Because the CRISP report goes through a number of stages in its production, with comments being made by other parties, it is important that individual paragraphs are clearly numbered and that different versions of the report are properly referenced and dated.
- 13 Those reports that were produced by consultants or Camden Consultancy Service (which although part of Camden Council carries out cycling work for other boroughs) were generally produced more rapidly than those produced in-house by other boroughs. In other respects, no clear preference emerged as to which type of organisation should be used for future studies.
- 14 Given that cycle route studies of this nature are relatively new in London, it would seem best to consolidate experience gained thus far by continuing to use the same design people, but to supplement their presentation and report-writing skills where necessary by training. TfL may need to take the initiative for this training, as those who require the training may not recognise that requirement.
- 15 The most encouraging conclusion to be drawn from this review of CRISP reports is that the underlying process appears to be a sound one. Where reports have fallen short of expectation, this has generally been the result not following detailed points that are covered in the brief. Whilst individually these departures may be relatively unimportant, their cumulative effect can be significant.
- 16 Nevertheless, the review has confirmed that overall, the CRISP reporting process appears to be resulting in reports that can confidently be used as a basis for scheme appraisal, planning, decision-making, delivery and promotion of LCN+ Links.

CONTENTS

<i>page</i>	
2	1 Introduction
2	Terms of reference
3	Assessment methodology
3	Limitations of this review
4	Choice of reports for review
6	2 Compliance with the CRISP specification
6	Compliance with London Cycling Design Standards
6	Drawings
8	Implementation programme
7	Conclusion on compliance with CRISP brief
8	Compliance with CRISP study indicative programme
9	Reports submitted as electronic documents
11	3 The Stakeholder's perspective
11	Stakeholder questionnaire
11	The Cycle Route Inspection Meeting (CRIM)
13	Clarity of the draft CRISP report
14	4 Areas for improvement
14	Cover sheet/flysheet
14	Report history
14	Contents page
15	Executive summary
15	Strategic context (sub-section 1.3)
15	Route numbering
16	Overall plan (sub-section 1.4)
16	Summary of data (Part 2)
17	Questionnaire (sub-section 3.3)
17	Drawings (Part 4)
18	Data Sheets (Part 5)
18	Appendices
18	General points on report style
20	5 Conclusions

APPENDICES

- A CRISP generic brief – Versions I and 2
- B Questions used for detailed review of each CRISP report
- C CRISP generic brief – suggested Version 3

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report provides a review of a selection of CRISP reports for cycle routes in London. The work has been carried out in accordance with an instruction from Transport for London (TfL) issued to Capita Symonds on 22 June 2006.

Terms of reference

- 1.2 To give the background to this review, the introductory section of TfL's brief to Capita Symonds is reproduced as follows:

“After consultation in 2002 Transport for London (TfL) started the planning and delivery of a 900km network of cycle routes on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) and on and off-carriageway in the London Boroughs. This strategic network of routes, called the London Cycle Network Plus (LCN+), when fully completed, will provide fast, safe, comfortable cycle routes with clear links through junctions. The target year for completion is 2009/10.

Funding for LCN+ schemes is provided to boroughs and TfL Area Teams, with programme management of schemes on borough roads being lead by a dedicated team at the London Borough of Camden (LBC).

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 input. The Cycle Route Implementation and Stakeholder Plan (CRISP) process was developed by TfL to satisfy these objectives.

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. Following a pilot study and consultation on a draft generic brief, a final generic brief was issued in May 2004. This was revised and re-issued as Version 2 in July 2005.

In May 2005, TfL published the London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS). This document sets out the principles, guidance and standards for designing to reduce barriers to cycling in order to support road safety targets and increased cycling in London. LCDS is referred to throughout the CRISP brief. It can be viewed on the TfL website.

The CRISP study is usually commissioned by the managing highway authority that has ownership of roads and paths that make up the Link. This will usually be a London Borough or TfL (for Links on the TLRN). The commissioning authority may choose to undertake the CRISP study using an ‘in-house’ team or it may put this work out to contract.

CRISP studies have been commissioned for over half of the LCN+ Links and a large number of Final CRISP reports have been produced to date.

The purpose of this commission is to carry out an assessment of the quality of a

selection of the Final CRISP reports produced to date. While the output from this commission will inform the continuous improvement of the CRISP process, this commission also addresses one of the actions in the TfL response to the scrutiny of the LCN+ project by the Greater London Authority (GLA) in 2005.

Analysis summary

The assessor is required to comprehensively analyse and report on a selection of Final CRISP reports (provided by TfL). These reports have been selected to reflect:

- *The range of different organisations that have commissioned and compiled CRISP reports to date*
- *The different length and characteristics of links currently reported on within the LCN+ (e.g. Inner/Outer London)*
- *Reports over a range of time that the CRISP process has been in place*

The output should reflect generic matters arising from the assessment and provide recommendations to improve the CRISP process and output. Criticism of specific reports is not the intention. Impartiality and confidentiality by the consultant is required.”

Assessment methodology

- 1.3 The initial task of the review was to compare each sample CRISP report against the specification applicable for that particular report. The two relevant specifications are attached as Appendix A to this report. Version 1 was issued in May 2004, and Version 2 was issued on 1 August 2005. The authors of reports that were currently underway when Version 2 was issued were asked to comply with the changed specification as far as reasonably practical.
- 1.4 These comparisons were undertaken using a standard list of questions, which were agreed between TfL and Capita Symonds following a pilot review carried out at the start of the commission. The standard questions are reproduced at Appendix B.
- 1.5 During the comparison process, a number of consistent themes arose. These are discussed later in this report, and suggestions are made as to how the CRISP process could be improved. At Appendix C, a draft Version 3 specification for CRISP studies is attached, showing the suggested changes from Version 2 highlighted.

Limitations of this review

- 1.6 This review has been carried out as a desk study, without visiting the relevant cycle routes, and without referring back to the authors of the reports nor the stakeholders consulted during the various studies.

- 1.7 Insofar that a CRISP report is intended to be a free-standing record of a study, that will be intelligible to others who were not involved in the study, an assessment that does not involve contact with those preparing the study is likely to maximise objectivity. Whilst there were a number of instances where it might have saved time to phone report authors to clarify points that were unclear, this would have defeated the objective of checking that the report was a clear record. Also, if conflicting views had arisen from such contacts, it would have been necessary to speak to both sides to obtain an objective view, which could have extended the scope of the assessment well beyond that originally envisaged.
- 1.8 Although a desk study of this nature will result in an audit of what is contained in each CRISP report, it will not show up any omissions of material that should have been in the CRISP report but has been excluded. Examples of possible such omissions from CRISP reports include:
- Non-inclusion of minutes of key meetings
 - Incomplete lists of attendees on meeting notes
 - Omission of key survey data and other comments supplied by consultees subsequent to the initial questionnaire responses.

Choice of reports for review

- 1.9 In selecting CRISP reports for review, TfL deliberately excluded any reports where Capita Symonds staff already had an involvement on behalf of stakeholders, either on a professional or voluntary basis. Nevertheless, the experience gained from such involvements cannot be unlearnt, and it has inevitably provided an added dimension to the review.
- 1.10 The CRISP reports reviewed were as follows:

<i>CRISP reports reviewed</i>							
<i>Borough</i>	<i>LCN link</i>	<i>Length (km)</i>			<i>Date of final report</i>	<i>Commissioning Authority</i>	<i>Report produced by</i>
		<i>Total</i>	<i>Borough</i>	<i>TLRN</i>			
Bexley	12	10.44	10.28	0.16	04/08/2005	Borough	Mayer Brown
Bromley	22	9.98	8.98	1.00	02/11/2005	Borough	Borough
Harrow	86	9.83	9.83	0	22/08/2005	Borough	WSP
Havering	90	3.92	0	3.92	24/08/2005	TfL	Faber Maunsell
Islington	106	4.19	4.19	0	29/11/2005	Borough	Borough
Islington	109	2.42	2.42	0	23/02/2006	Borough	Camden Consultancy Service
Merton	148	7.06	6.89	0.17	15/02/2006	Borough	Mayer Brown
Southwark	183	5.24	2.96	2.28	02/02/2006	Borough	Jacobs Babtie
Southwark	185	1.20	0	1.20	01/04/2005	TfL	Colin Buchanan
Sutton	192	9.22	9.09	0.13	30/08/2005	Borough	Borough

- 1.11 The remainder of this report is structured as follows. Chapter 2 summarises the result of the assessment of the sample CRISP reports examined, and their

compliance with the standard CRISP brief. Chapter 3 considers the process from the perspective of a busy stakeholder who needs briefing as clearly and quickly as possible. Chapter 4 cover suggestions for the improvement of CRISP reports, based on best practice gleaned from the various reports. These are mostly minor points but cumulatively could make a significant difference. Finally, Chapter 5 draws together a number of conclusions.

2. COMPLIANCE WITH THE CRISP SPECIFICATION

- 2.1 The assessment of the sample CRISP reports supplied showed that with the exception of the drawings, in broad terms they all conformed reasonably well to the required specification. Although in some instances there were minor departures, these did not detract from a general consistency between the reports in terms of structure and layout.
- 2.2 This consistent specification has the advantage that those responsible for managing the programme should readily be able to find detailed information about particular topics.
- 2.3 There was evidence, however, that the standardised format has made it easy to transfer standard paragraphs from one report to another, and that in some instances an insufficiently thorough check has been carried out that the transferred sections are still relevant. One illustration of this is where rail stations are quoted as generators of cycling trips, which in some instances is undoubtedly correct but in others is not.

Compliance with London Cycling Design Standards

- 2.4 The specification requires CRISP studies to take account of the London Cycling Design Standards when considering strategy and treatment options. For studies that commenced prior to publication of LCDS, account was to be taken of the draft version of LCDS. This generally happened, although in certain cases insufficient attention was given to the need to check the reasonableness of the overall route (LCDS paragraph 2.2.12 refers). In another case, the possibility of routing the LCN+ route through a largely traffic-free town centre was not investigated (LCDS paragraph 1.4.13 refers).
- 2.5 Pedestrian interface issues were generally covered satisfactorily, apart from two of the reports where the off-road sections merited a more detailed examination. LCN+ routes are generally on-street, so this was not a major consideration in the majority of studies.

Drawings

- 2.6 The main area where the specification was not always followed was the drawings. The required information for the drawings is set out on the CRISP specification, which requires as a minimum an A3 size overall plan (item 1.4 in the specification), and 1:2500 scale plans showing the existing situation (item 4.1) and the study's recommendations (item 4.2).
- 2.7 The specifications for the drawings are identical in Versions 1 and 2 of the CRISP brief. The only additional point mentioned in Version 2 as compared with Version 1 is that it may be appropriate to include a map extract from the relevant London Cycle Guide(s) with the Link to be studied marked on it. None of the reports produced after the issue of Version 2 adopted this idea, notwithstanding that it is also mentioned in the London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS) at paragraph 2.3.18.

Overall plan

- 2.8 The specification sets out clearly the format required for the overall plan, which is intended to put the study in context. Those plans that followed the specification closely tended to be easier to read than those that did not.
- 2.9 The overall plan is particularly important for anyone reading the Executive Summary at the start of the report, as this is the first plan in the report that can be referred to.
- 2.10 The most common departures from the specification were the use of base mapping that was hard to read, the use of solid route colouring that obscured street names, and the omission of borough boundaries and/or names. Also, the specification for the overall plan requires other LCN+ Links and LCN routes in the area to be shown, but this information was not always provided.

Existing Situation plan

- 2.11 A comparison of the information shown on the “Existing Situation” plans with the specification shows a high degree of non-compliance. The majority of these plans do not show the locations of existing bus lanes, traffic signals, parking and loading restrictions, speed limits and speed survey data, main motor vehicle and bus movements, and existing cycle problems. All these items are included in the specification for this drawing.
- 2.12 In many instances the missing information from the drawings is given in the text of the report. However this is not usually as clear to the reader as a well-prepared drawing would be. For example, a list of bus routes in the text does not give such a clear idea of bus route frequency as a series of simple boxed notes on a drawing.
- 2.13 For one of the Links, which happened to be one of the shortest and most straightforward Links in the review sample, the drawing showing the existing situation was combined with the recommendations plan. The information shown on the existing situation made it one of the most compliant drawings reviewed, and one of the most informative, notwithstanding that it was combined with the recommendations plan.
- 2.14 At the other extreme, another relatively compliant set of drawings showed so much information about the existing situation that it was not easy to read. This was the most complicated of the Links considered, and the drawings demonstrated that to try and fit all the required information onto a single plan or set of plans will not always be practical in complex situations, if legibility is to be retained.

Recommendations plan

- 2.15 The “Recommendations” plans generally complied with the specification more closely, but again the usefulness of each drawing reviewed was directly related to the level of compliance with the specification. The most common omissions

were the subdivision of the Link into Sections, and the inclusion of alternative routes as dashed lines where applicable.

- 2.16 The Recommendations plan for the most complex Link reviewed illustrated how difficult it is to show a large amount of information clearly on a single plan. The specification mentions the possibility of additional drawings being provided to clarify recommendations or for supporting information, but none of the reports took up this suggestion.

Implementation programme

- 2.17 Each CRISP report included a provisional programme for implementation. In all cases these appeared achievable in the light of the information provided, subject on one scheme to third party land being acquired (which may or may not prove straightforward). However in the light of the time taken to undertake the CRISP studies themselves – a point that is discussed below – it will require a concerted effort by the parties concerned to maintain momentum during scheme preparation to ensure that programmes are met.

Conclusion on compliance with CRISP brief

- 2.18 The fact that those reports that complied most closely with the brief were the easiest to follow suggests that the brief is essentially a sound one.
- 2.19 In a number of instances, points of non-compliance were picked up by the LCN+ team representative consulted at the draft CRISP report stage, but were not then corrected before the report was finalised. The reasons for this were not normally evident.
- 2.20 Where a non-compliant item is accepted on one study, there is a danger that the same format will be carried forward to the next study and the same lack of clarity will recur. This applies particularly to the drawings, where for example a poor choice of pen settings or an inadequate key can negate much of the effort that went into producing the drawing.
- 2.21 It is therefore particularly important to make sure that the draft CRISP report check by the LCN+ team is very thorough on the first report produced by each consultant or local authority. The commissioning authority should be satisfied that the comments received have been acted on, before accepting the final study report. This will create the right expectations for future studies.
- 2.22 Compliance with the brief will not in itself ensure that a CRISP report is easy to understand. There was a wide range of writing styles and graphic presentation amongst the reports, with some clear and easy and others much more difficult to follow. Some design organisations are better at producing clear reports than others. Suggestions on how the quality of CRISP reports could be improved are included in chapter 4 of this report. Before that, chapter 3 discusses the audience at which the reports should be aimed.

Compliance with CRISP study indicative programme

- 2.23 The generic CRISP brief sets out indicative durations for the various activities, and includes an indicative programme. The actual target programme for each scheme reviewed will have depended on the complexity of the Link, and should have been specified when each commission was set up.
- 2.24 As a test of compliance with programme, a check has been carried out on the time elapsed between the CRIM and the submission of the final CRISP report. The indicative durations given in Version 1 of the brief were more ambitious than those in Version 2. On the basis of the durations given, the indicative times between the date of the CRIM and submission of the final CRISP report are 5½ weeks with Version 1, and 7½ weeks with Version 2.
- 2.25 The times actually achieved ranged from 11 weeks to 54 weeks, with an average time of 26 weeks.
- 2.26 None of the reports gave a specific reason for any non-compliance with programme, although one report did indicate route changes that might have accounted for the delay. If that report is excluded, the average times from CRIM to final CRISP report completion were 38 weeks for reports prepared by boroughs, and 16 weeks for reports prepared by consultants (for the purposes of this comparison, Camden Consultancy Service is treated as a consultant notwithstanding that it is part of Camden Council, bearing in mind that they carry out work for other boroughs).
- 2.27 There was no direct correlation between the quality of the reports and the time taken as assessed above.
- 2.28 It would appear that even the Version 2 indicative dates are over-ambitious, and that more realistic timescales need to be set. These have not been incorporated into the draft Version 3 at the end of this report, but need to be agreed by those directly concerned with processing the reports.

Reports submitted as electronic documents

- 2.29 Two of the reports were submitted only in electronic format, as pdf files on a CD. In practice it was necessary to print these out to make them easier to read, which took some time.
- 2.30 It is helpful to provide two versions of the report on the CD:
- A complete version with all pages in sequential order, for reading on screen and to show how the document fits together.
 - A series of files with similar printing requirements e.g. pages that are A4 black and white, A4 colour, A3 black and white, A3 colour, and large plans (assembly of the report will then be much easier if all the pages are numbered).

- 2.31 All relevant plans and appendices must be included on the CD. This will avoid the need for having to locate these separately, as happened with one of the reports reviewed.
- 2.32 One of the two reports supplied electronically was a single pdf file of size 233Mb. The other was in five files totalling 12Mb, yet the graphics were just as sharp and in many cases better. Given that one of the reasons for having electronic versions of reports is to make it possible to email them, and to scroll through them rapidly on screen, it makes sense to keep file sizes down. This can readily be achieved by using the correct software.

3. THE STAKEHOLDER'S PERSPECTIVE

- 3.1 A key part of the CRISP process is the obtaining of inputs from stakeholders. A list of stakeholders is included in the brief for each study, and a summary of usual stakeholders is set out in LCDS at paragraph 2.3.9.

Stakeholder questionnaire

- 3.2 At the initial questionnaire stage, the quality of response will depend considerably on the way in which the proposed cycle route is presented to consultees. An important part of the questionnaire pack is the drawing showing the proposed route. However very few of the CRISP reports reviewed included a copy of the drawing issued with the questionnaire. It is suggested that the inclusion of this should become a standard requirement for future CRISP reports.
- 3.3 The lists of consultees ranged from relatively short (under 20) to quite long (in excess of 50). There was little consistency on the choice of consultees. For many of the reports reviewed, the consultee list included a significant representation from local schools, possibly because these are easy to identify. Although cycling to school is potentially important at all age levels, the main relevance of cycling for educational trips will be for older age groups. However, higher education establishments did not often feature on the lists.
- 3.4 Local councillors were sometimes but not always included on consultee lists. When they were included, their responses were amongst the most useful. Residents' associations did not often feature, but should be a useful source of local information.
- 3.5 The largest single category of trip generation is likely to be employment, which was generally under-represented on consultee lists. This may be because of the difficulty in co-ordinating a response from the business community, but little attempt generally seems to have been made to achieve this.

The Cycle Route Inspection Meeting (CRIM)

- 3.6 In practice the key stakeholders who attend the CRIM will normally be:
- The relevant highway authority or authorities;
 - Other borough departments e.g. parks;
 - The LCN+ team;
 - Representatives from cycling interest groups; and
 - In some instances, a representative of major local cycle generator such as a large employer, shopping centre or proposed development.
- 3.7 The quality of feedback will depend considerably on the effort that goes into preparing the background material. Local cycling groups will usually have a

very useful input to make, but to attend a CRIM will often mean the attendee taking a day off work. Preparing for the CRIM can be made much easier if the material is well presented at that stage, and issued in good time before the CRIM rather than just a few days beforehand. The requirement in the brief is for issuing the material a minimum of two weeks before the CRIM.

- 3.8 A vital part of the background information should be a clear explanation of why the particular link was selected for inclusion in the LCN+ network, and how it fits into the overall network for that part of London. None of the reports reviewed included an extract from the overall LCN+ route map. This is particularly relevant where routes join at right angles, for instance at a node adjacent to a barrier such as a railway or river. In such cases the natural desire line for cyclists is likely to involve “cutting the corner” and this will need reviewing at the start of the CRIM (LCDS paragraph 2.2.12).
- 3.9 Local cycling interests will be familiar with the London Cycling Guides as their basic source of information when planning cycle trips. The choice of mapping format for these guides was arrived at after careful thought, and the format has widely been accepted as a clear way of presenting routes in London. Four million copies of the maps have now been printed. It is therefore very surprising that none of the reports reviewed contained any plans based on this mapping.
- 3.10 Indeed, during this review reference to the London Cycle Guides proved to be essential in a number of instances, to identify how the various plans fitted into the overall road system. Narrow adjacent strips of 1:2500 mapping can be hard to read, particularly when they are not all orientated the same way relative to north, and when no cut lines are shown. Anything that can be done to ease the task of CRIM stakeholders in understanding the issues will pay dividends in terms of improving the quality of feedback.

Pre-CRIM rides

- 3.11 In order to overcome the difficulty of obtaining input from local cyclists during the working week, at least one local branch of London Cycling Campaign (Ealing) has adopted a procedure whereby a group of members cycle the route at a weekend before the CRIM takes place, and then submit a written briefing paper to assist the CRIM. In this way, feedback can be obtained from a spectrum of cyclists rather than just from the representative attending the CRIM.
- 3.12 None of the studies reviewed mentioned that they had used a similar procedure, although it may have happened in other boroughs not represented in the sample. It would seem worth exploring the procedure with local cycling groups in other boroughs besides Ealing on future studies, before the CRIM takes place. The procedure requires effort and commitment by the local cycling group, but it must also be recognised that such events provide a useful focus for local groups who otherwise can have difficulty in involving their members in the promotion of cycling in a structured way.
- 3.13 Where written inputs of this kind are provided by consultees, it is essential that they be included in the CRISP report. Where the report’s recommendations

differ from those of consultees, there needs to be a clear explanation of the reasoning.

- 3.14 None of the reports reviewed contained written feedback from consultees other than questionnaires and comments on the draft CRISP report. Whilst this may reflect a genuine lack of other feedback, the absence of any such material seems surprising in the context of so many reports.

The CRIM record note

- 3.15 As with the CRIM briefing material, it will assist all parties if the record of the CRIM is well structured and presented. The CRIM notes reviewed ranged from what appeared to be a verbatim record of comments in the order in which they were made, to careful summaries of the consensus view on each element of the route with a note of any dissention if this occurred. The latter format was far more useful as a record, and much easier for consultees to check.
- 3.16 Where all CRIM attendees are reasonably computer-literate, a simple spreadsheet format may be useful for the draft CRIM note. A good example is the format adopted by Colin Buchanan and Partners for Link 101 (not included in the sample), which was particularly easy for consultees to read on-screen and comment on.

Clarity of the draft CRISP report

- 3.17 As with earlier stages in the consultation process, the quality of feedback on the draft CRISP report will be far better if those commenting on it can readily understand it. During the course of this review, it took over a day to understand what some of the sample reports were saying, but others could be read through in a logical sequence from start to finish in a relatively short time. Busy people who are asked to comment on a draft CRISP report will be discouraged if they find the logic hard to follow, and may reduce their input accordingly.
- 3.18 It is particularly important to explain how any route changes have occurred, and for the drawings and the drawing keys to illustrate this in an unambiguous way. In some of the reports examined, the writer appeared to take it as read that all readers would be reasonably familiar with route changes that had occurred. This will often not be the case a year later, when different individuals are involved and the CRISP report is the only record of earlier work.
- 3.19 The next chapter suggests ways in which the quality of reports can be improved.

4. AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

- 4.1 The suggestions in this chapter cover a number of matters that in themselves are generally minor, but which collectively should improve the quality of future CRISP reports.
- 4.2 As noted earlier, the current specification for the CRISP report is essentially satisfactory. Most of the points below relate to general report presentation technique, which should apply to any transport planning report. Nearly all of them were followed in at least one of the reports reviewed, but not in all of them. The objective is to bring together best practice from each report and apply it to all reports in future.
- 4.3 A draft revised version of the specification is attached at Appendix C. The points that follow are dealt with in the order in which they appear in a standard CRISP report, and can be seen highlighted in red in Appendix C. No deletions have been made from the Version 2 brief except where text coloured red has been substituted.

Cover sheet/flysheet

- 4.4 The title needs to give some brief indication of where the Link is located within the borough, as well as the LCN+ Link number(s) applicable.

Report history

- 4.5 A number of the reports included at the front a standard document record sheet, presumably required by the author's quality management system, but these varied in how informative they were. It is suggested that they be expanded to include a table showing the following four standard columns, giving key dates starting with the date of appointment of the consultant or design organisation:

Milestone activity	Programmed date	Achieved date	Document reference
--------------------	-----------------	---------------	--------------------

- 4.6 The table will be updated as the report progresses from a pre-CRIM document to a draft CRISP report, and eventually a final CRISP report. The document reference should then be carried through as a standard footer throughout the document, so that anyone picking up a draft or an extract from a draft will know which version it is.

Contents page

- 4.7 The reports varied greatly in the usefulness of the contents page. The Version 2 brief requires the "paragraph numbers" to be included in the contents, but these were not always provided. What is presumably actually intended is a list of what might best be described as "sub-sections" rather than paragraphs, and it is suggested that this nomenclature be used. (If the term "sections" were used this might be confused with Sections of the Link).

- 4.8 In most of the reports the individual paragraphs were in fact numbered using a decimal system e.g. 1.3.2. It is suggested that this becomes a standard requirement, as it makes it easier for people to give exact references to the points they are referring to. The LCDS document provides a good example of this.
- 4.9 The Version 2 specification requires page numbers to be given, but some of the reports did not have these for all pages, particularly where the pages appeared to have been generated as spreadsheets. However other reports included these throughout, and as a result were easier to follow.

Executive summary

- 4.10 The executive summary needs to concentrate on what were the real issues arising during the study. General objectives such as the intention to raise cycling levels by 200% should only be quoted in a London-wide context, unless they are genuinely applicable to the specific link.
- 4.11 In order to understand the summary, it is helpful to have a plan showing the route in overall context. This could be a useful place to include an extract of the relevant London Cycle Guide, showing the route highlighted by a line of black dots positioned so as not to obscure street names.
- 4.12 If the executive summary is printed on coloured paper it is easier to find.

Strategic context (sub-section 1.3)

- 4.13 It was rarely clear from the reports reviewed why the particular Link had been included in the LCN+ network. With the passage of time, the work that led to the selection of the current LCN+ network is becoming less well known about. The overall map of LCN+ routes is only updated annually. The version currently on the LCN+ website is now 15 months old.
- 4.14 It would therefore be useful to include an extract from the current overall LCN+ route network plan, updated to reflect any agreed changes to other Link routes in the immediate vicinity.
- 4.15 It would also be useful to define the purpose of the Link under study more clearly than sometimes happens. For example, if there is a main commuting route for cyclists along a busy road, but there is a parallel quieter route or routes for cyclists in less of a hurry, then it needs to be explained clearly why one has been chosen for the LCN+ Link and not the other. If appropriate, it also needs to be stated how the parallel route is to be developed as a borough cycle route. Stakeholders need reassurance where the choice is not between competing routes, but between competing priorities for funding.

Route numbering

- 4.16 The route numbering system appeared to have confused not only stakeholders but also some of those involved in producing the CRISP studies. The various

types of route included in London's cycle network are summarised in LCDS section 1.4.

- 4.17 The route numbering developed for the old LCN network was introduced for use on signs to assist cyclists on longer journeys, albeit that it does not appear on the London Cycle Guides.
- 4.18 In contrast, the LCN+ Link numbering system appears to have been developed to produce definable links, each within a single borough, that are suitable as targets for individual CRISP studies. This has resulted in route descriptions in CRISP reports like "London Cycle Network Route 24, Link 192" which can be confusing. Such a description implies that all parts of Route 24 will have a Link number, which may or may not be the case. A route may also have a National Cycle Network number.
- 4.19 Now that a significant proportion of the LCN+ network has been examined in more detail, the route numbering review referred to at LCDS paragraph 6.6.14 needs to be progressed.

Overall plan (sub-section 1.4)

- 4.20 The quality of plans at sub-section 1.4 ranged from clear to almost illegible. Where the format required by the brief was followed, the plan was normally acceptable. However there needs to be an explicit requirement for street names not to be obscured by the coloured cycle route lines added to the plan.
- 4.21 Most of the plans gave "NTS" as the scale, even when it was evident that the map did have a scale (or an approximate scale where A-Z street mapping was used). It is helpful to readers if the scale is stated.

Summary of data (Part 2)

- 4.22 In a number of instances the reports presented data in text format, where simple drawings would have been much clearer. Two examples are general traffic flows and bus frequencies. Many boroughs hold borough-wide traffic flow diagrams which, even if approximate, give a reasonable idea of which are the busy roads a cyclist needs to contend with. For bus flows, what matters is the flow of buses on each street in the study area. A list of bus route origins and destinations is usually irrelevant to a cycle study, except as a working document used to calculate the flow of buses.
- 4.23 The A-Z mapping used as the base for the London Cycle Guides gives an indication of a road's importance by the width at which it is shown. Whilst this is not an infallible indication, it means that this style of mapping can be useful for showing background information.
- 4.24 Given that the brief only requires the standard data items to be included where actually applicable, the present categories are useful. However one minor adjustment could be made - bus stations are included as potential generators of cycling movement, but this will so rarely be the case that this item could be

deleted. Similarly, whilst some rail stations will generate cycling traffic, minor stations close to a larger station with a much more frequent service will rarely attract significant cycle movement unless they have exceptionally good and secure cycle parking facilities, which the larger station does not have.

Questionnaire (sub-section 3.3)

- 4.25 The accompanying plan forms an essential part of the questionnaire and needs to be included in the CRISP report.

Drawings (Part 4)

- 4.26 The large size drawings were generally the area where the reviewed reports strayed furthest from the brief. This is discussed in more detail in chapter 2 above.
- 4.27 Some of the hardest drawings to read had very pale grey mapping. This may require to be rectified by the design offices concerned on a general basis and not just for CRISP reports, if it relates to printer settings. Where adjacent strips of mapping are presented on a single drawing sheet, it is usual to provide a box to define the edge of each area of mapping. However when the box is printed in an equally pale shade of grey, the mapping strips tend to merge together. Also important is the requirement for street names to be printed on top of route colouring or alongside the route, and not be obscured by the route colouring.
- 4.28 It is essential for every map or mapping strip to have a north point on it. This is particularly important when not all drawings or mapping strips within a report have the same orientation.
- 4.29 One of the reviewed reports had the plastic pockets holding the large drawings bound into the end of the report, rather than at Part 4. This made handling of the report easier, and allowed page numbers to run through sequentially. It also improved the logical flow of the report, insofar that the recommendations plan ought not to precede the data sheets in Part 5.
- 4.30 Some of the drawing keys were inadequate, and an additional item covering this should be included in the brief.
- 4.31 Borough boundaries need to be shown by a line that looks quite different from lines showing cycle routes.

The term “Alternative Route”

- 4.32 On some of the plans there appears to have been confusion on the meaning of the term “Alternative Route”. In some cases the term has been used where there are, say, two ways of getting from A to B by similar types of road of similar length, and it has to be decided which should be developed as the LCN+ Link. In this case, one will form part of the eventual cycle network but the other will not.

- 4.33 In other cases the term has been used to describe a different way of getting from A to B that may be applicable at certain times of day or night, such as a route via busier roads that may have to be used when a more direct route across a park is closed. In such cases it may be more helpful to refer to one of the routes as a “night-time route” or similar, to clarify the relative status of the routes.

Data sheets (Part 5)

- 4.34 The standard of the data sheets appeared generally to be high, although this was difficult to check in the absence of site visits.
- 4.35 One feature that would have assisted a reader unfamiliar with the particular Link would have been a symbol ♂ on the plan identifying the Sections and Elements, to indicate the direction in which the photograph was taken. However this should not be needed for readers generally familiar with the area.
- 4.36 The brief requires the summary of the Data Sheets to be shown on A3 size paper (sub-section 5.2). Those reports that followed this format were easier to follow. The brief also asks for recommended options to be distinguished in the summary by the use of bold type. This is not always easy to distinguish in the printed version, particularly where it has been reduced to A4 size.

Appendices

- 4.37 For the summary note of the CRIM, the brief lists the key requirements to be covered. As noted earlier (paragraph 3.15) this will not easily be achieved by a verbatim list of comments.
- 4.38 The use of the term “LCN+” both for the network and for the programme management team is not always conducive to clear note taking. It would be sensible to refer always to either the LCN+ Link or route or to the LCN+ Programme Management Team (possibly shortened to the LCN+ PM Team). This distinction needs to be followed through to the LCN+ team’s letterhead.
- 4.39 Specific provision needs to be made in the brief for the inclusion of significant written inputs to the study, additional to the questionnaire responses and formal comments on the draft CRISP report.
- 4.40 For longer reports, the use of tabbed dividers can be useful for appendices.

General points on report style

- 4.41 Justified text may arguably improve a report’s appearance but it will not make it easier to read. This is particularly true when paragraphs are more than a few lines long, although over-long paragraphs should in any event be avoided. The normal fonts used for office word processing only adjust the spacing between words, not between individual letters, and were not really designed to be justified.

- 4.42 Following basic grammar rules will assist ease of reading. Sentences without main verbs or with too many main verbs are hard to follow and can introduce ambiguity.
- 4.43 The better reports were easy to read and set a good standard.

5. CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 The first and most encouraging conclusion to be drawn from this review of CRISP reports is that the underlying process appears to be a sound one. Where reports have fallen short of expectation, this has generally been the result of the writer not following detailed points that are covered in the brief. Whilst individually these departures may be relatively unimportant, their cumulative effect can significantly influence the transparency of the reporting process.
- 5.2 The studies generally took good account of the London Cycling Design Standards when considering strategy and treatment options. However in certain cases insufficient attention was given to the need to consider possible route alignment alternatives (LCDS paragraph 2.2.12).
- 5.3 Pedestrian interface issues were generally covered satisfactorily, apart from two of the reports where the off-road sections merited a more detailed examination.
- 5.4 The main area in which improvement is required is the clarity of the drawings. Some of these were good, but a style needs to be developed that draws together best practice from CRISP reports received so far, and used as a standard for future similar studies.
- 5.5 In cases where the route of a Link is well defined and obviously correct at the start of a CRISP study, the quality of the drawings will be less of an issue than where a review of the route is needed as part of the study. In the latter case, poor drawings can inhibit correct decision-making on the choice of route.
- 5.6 There is also a need to improve the introductory part of the reports, to more clearly set the Link being studied in context, including a better explanation of why that particular route was chosen. Associated with this, there is a need to progress the route numbering review referred to at LCDS paragraph 6.6.14.
- 5.7 None of the reports used extracts from the London Cycle Guides, which are widely used by London cyclists and are well understood. It would be sensible to include extracts in future CRISP reports, as suggested at LCDS paragraph 2.3.18.
- 5.8 None of the reports were produced within the indicative times set out in the generic CRISP brief. The times given in Version 2 of the brief are less optimistic than those in Version 1, but even so they still need to be reviewed and more realistic times set. The reports prepared by consultants and Camden Consultancy Service (which carries out cycling work for other boroughs) were generally produced more expeditiously than those produced by boroughs other than Camden.
- 5.9 In other respects, no firm view can be expressed as a result of this review as to whether reports are better produced by in-house design organisations or by external consultants. Given that cycle route studies of this nature are relatively new in London, it would seem best to consolidate experience gained thus far by continuing to use the same design people, but to supplement their presentation and report-writing skills where necessary by training. The initiative for this

training may need to be taken by TfL, as those who require the training may not recognise that requirement.

- 5.10 Each CRISP report included a provisional programme for implementation. In all cases these appeared reasonably achievable taking into account the information provided. However in the light of the time taken to undertake the CRISP studies themselves, it will require a concerted effort by the parties concerned to maintain momentum during scheme preparation to ensure that programmes are met.
- 5.11 The comments made by the LCN+ team on the first draft CRISP report provided by any design organisation are of particular importance, and should be reviewed carefully by commissioning authorities before reports are finalised and accepted. The acceptance of a sub-optimal style will create a wrong expectation for what will be acceptable on future reports, which may not be for the same client body. The co-ordinating organisation for the LCN+ programme, LB Camden, is not the client authority for the CRISP studies on which it advises, and can only make recommendations on draft CRISP reports.
- 5.12 Where the CRISP report has been prepared by a borough's in-house design team, an independent view (e.g. from the LCN+ sector leader) should be sought as to whether the final version is acceptable before the study is regarded as complete. In some instances this may sometimes result in training needs being identified.
- 5.13 This review has not included a site visit to any of the Links under study. This has limited the extent to which it has been possible to check the data sheets, which form a central part of each study. It will only be when detailed designs are available for each Element of a Link that it will be possible to check that the principles of the LCDS are being followed to the full.
- 5.14 Similarly, the review has not involved discussion with the relevant stakeholders. It is essential that all relevant inputs from stakeholders are being captured in the CRISP report process, as provided for in the brief. A desk study cannot check that this has fully happened in each report reviewed.
- 5.15 Although stakeholders' inputs generally appeared to be well recorded, in one or two instances it appeared that stakeholders' suggestions for route deviations had not been accepted, but without the reasons being stated. It is important that this should not happen in future reports. In some instances the alternatives arose because a junction or element appeared to stakeholders to be incapable of improvement. In such cases it may be necessary to carry out sufficient design at a more detailed level, to satisfy the parties that at least one feasible option does in fact exist for improving the preferred alignment.
- 5.16 As an output of this review, a draft amended version of the generic CRISP brief has been prepared. This is included at Appendix C.
- 5.17 Finally, it needs to be stated that the review has shown that a great deal of useful work has been carried out in preparation for improving London's cycle network. It is evident that those preparing the reports have embraced the CRISP process, and that the involvement of stakeholders is proving useful.

APPENDIX A

CRISP generic brief – Versions 1 and 2

CRISP generic brief – Version 1



LCN+ Cycle Route Implementation and Stakeholder Plan (CRISP)

Project Brief

Items in italics to be completed by the Client.

Introduction

Describe the Link location and broad context in terms of land use, road traffic and cycling and identify any specific relevant reports or other information to be taken into account.

Purpose of Commission

The purpose is to undertake a systematic review of the existing conditions for cycling on Link number XX, taking full account of local knowledge, constraints and concerns. Route alignment, issues, opportunities and constraints (physical and institutional) are to be considered in conjunction with stakeholders.

Recommendations for solutions most likely to be successful in attracting substantially increased levels of cycling (c200%) will be made and budget cost estimates and a provisional outline programme prepared.

Recommendations could include detailed technical feasibility studies, modelling, surveys etc. which are not part of this brief.

Design Standards

When considering strategy and treatment options, the content of the draft London Cycling Design Standards is to be taken into account. The principles of providing continuous, safe and comfortable conditions for cycling, with minimal delay to cycle journey times should be followed.

Opportunities and Constraints

Constraints including geographical/landscape barriers, link and junction capacity and competing priorities for road space must be allowed for.

In assessing options and costs and making recommendations the requirements and practicalities for implementation, maintenance and enforcement are to be taken into account.

Outputs

The following documents are to be prepared in accordance with the detailed specification in Annex 1 to this brief.

- Pre-CRIM Report
- Record of CRIM
- Draft CRISP Report
- Final CRISP Report



Methodology / Sequence

Stage 1 – Preparation, data collection, summary and dissemination

- Inception meeting with Client to discuss brief and agree programme. Client to hand over information to consultant (see schedule below)
- Finalise a schedule of CRIM and other stakeholders (see below for guidance) with contact details (Client to prepare draft schedule)
- Issue questionnaire to other stakeholders within 1 week of the start of the commission with a deadline for responses within 3 weeks See **Annex 2** for example letter and questionnaire)
- Commence liaison with CRIM stakeholders to suggest and agree dates for the CRIM
- Obtain available data on cycle flows (including joining/leaving and crossing the Link), and cycle accidents (last 3 years).
(If cycle flow information is not available from the Client, the LCN+ Project Management office at London Borough of Camden may be able to provide appropriate data)
- Obtain available data on motor vehicle flows, turning movements, speeds, HGV and bus flows/proportions, link and junction capacity and related issues.
- Review pedestrian amenity on the Link and pedestrian/cycle interface issues, such as footway cycling concerns
- Record existing characteristics on the Link including:
 - Major trip generators, including bus and rail stations, educational establishments, major employers, retail centres
 - broad land use, frontage activity, bus stops, parking and loading restrictions
 - carriageway, footway and other widths, relevant highway boundaries
 - existing facilities for cyclists including extent and widths of lanes, tracks and paths (noting whether on or off-carriageway), Advanced Stop Lines, crossing facilities etc.
 - existing problems for cyclists including pinchpoints, discontinuities, deviations, narrow tracks, poor surface, ponding, unclear facilities, legal restrictions, enforcement issues, etc.
- Review and summarise the following provided by the Client (more detailed guidance later in this brief):
 - relevant existing reports, correspondence and the like
 - schedule of significant current programmed/proposed schemes and/or studies on the Link funded under LCN+ or non-LCN+ budgets
 - schedule of current/programmed public or private sector developments that may have a direct or indirect effect on the Link or alternative routes (add others if they become known during the study)
 - information on significant services plant which could provide a constraint on infrastructure construction or alignment
- Consider alternative routes to be studied taking into account views of stakeholders, including responses to questionnaires, and agree with the Client
- Provisional division of Links into **Sections** of similar characteristics defined by factors such as traffic flow, speed limit/recorded speeds, land use,



frontage activity (including parking and loading), corridor/carriageway width with the objective of providing consistent solutions on each **Section**

- Prepare Pre-CRIM Report. This forms the basis for Parts 1.1 to 4.1 of the Draft CRISP Report with the addition of a 1 page Executive Summary.
- Issue the pre-CRIM report and the formal invitation to the CRIM to CRIM Stakeholders at least 2 weeks before the CRIM (it is envisaged that the dates of the CRIM and pre-CRIM meeting will have been informally agreed with CRIM Stakeholders in advance of this date)

See **Annex 3** for an example Pre-CRIM Report issue letter

- During the week preceding the CRIM, hold a pre-CRIM meeting* to agree the scope, practical arrangements (eg meeting point, lunch stop and a timetable for the day) for the CRIM with the Client and CRIM invitees. A practical approach to the timing and duration of the pre-CRIM meeting is required to accommodate voluntary sector attendants. A meeting late in the afternoon of no more than two hours duration is suggested.

*Subject to the agreement of the CRIM Stakeholders (excluding CCE), a pre-CRIM meeting is not necessary if the objectives of the meeting can be met by other means.

Stage 2 – Cycle Route Inspection Meeting (CRIM)

- Consultant to host the CRIM
- The CRIM should not take place without the attendance of a representative of the relevant highway authority(ies). This would preferably be the borough cycle officer and a senior officer from the highways department
- All reasonable effort should be made to ensure that a representative from LCC attends the CRIM.
- The CRIM should take place on bicycles or on foot. A suggestion is to first cycle the whole Link from one end to the other then return along the Link, stopping to consider specific locations.
- Issue a “Record of CRIM” to all invitees within 2 weeks of it taking place (This to form Appendix A to the Final CRISP Report)

Stage 3 – Prepare & issue Draft CRISP report

(See Annex 1 for format and detailed content)

- Refer to the draft London Cycling Design Standards
- Using information obtained during Stages 1 and 2 review problems and develop strategy options for each **Section/Element** in conjunction with the Client, involving other stakeholders as appropriate
- Assess the strategy options in terms of their advantages, disadvantages, and feasibility.
- Prepare budget costs for options
- Recommend preferred option with reasons
- Allocate the recommended options to a programme year (The need for close liaison between the consultant and highway authority and LCN+ project management team (LB Camden) regarding budget costs and outline programme is emphasised to produce realistic and achievable outcomes)



- Compile Draft CRISP report
- Issue Draft CRISP report to CRIM stakeholders within 3 weeks of the CRIM, with deadline for comments of 2 weeks
- Arrange Draft Report Review meeting with CRIM and any other appropriate stakeholders within 1 week of issue of the report

Stage 4 – Prepare and Issue Final CRISP report

- Revise the Draft CRISP report to produce the Final CRISP report taking into account comments received on the draft and matters raised at the Draft Report Review meeting
- Issue the Final report to the CRIM Stakeholders (two copies to the Client) within 1 week of the draft report review meeting referred to in Stage 3



Stakeholders

The Stakeholders will be identified by the Client during Stage 1 and will be split into two groups:

1. The CRIM stakeholders:
 - The highway authority (Client) ie the borough cycling officer and senior highways department officer (and/or leisure/parks department where appropriate) or TfL Area Team officer for Links on TLRN
 - London Borough of Camden LCN+ Project Management team for Links on borough roads
 - TfL Area Team (for schemes on borough roads that interface or affect the Transport for London Road Network)
 - London Cycling Campaign local representative and/or other local cycling group representatives such as CTC
 - Sustrans - where the route is on or interfaces with a National Cycle Network route or where a local Sustrans supporter has been identified (Sustrans HO to liaise with LCN+ project management on this matter)
 - TfL Cycling Centre of Excellence (note CCE are not expected to attend most CRIMs but wish to be invited and receive the pre-CRIM Report for monitoring purposes)

2. Other stakeholders (this list of examples may not be exhaustive):
 - ward councillors along the Link
 - lead member for environment
 - representatives from adjacent highway authorities (to address cross-boundary issues),
 - local Police,
 - TfL London Buses (Bus Priority Projects and Bus Operations)
 - TfL signals (NID),
 - London Borough of Camden LCN+ Project Management team for Links on TLRN
 - Royal Parks Authority,
 - British Waterways,
 - Corporation of London where open spaces affected are under their control (eg Epping Forest)
 - town centre managers,
 - educational establishments,
 - residents groups,
 - petitioners,
 - major employers,
 - traders representatives,
 - affected landowners



Meetings

The following meetings (excluding the CRIM) should be allowed for:

- Inception meeting
- Pre-CRIM meeting
- Review of Draft CRISP Report meeting
-

The consultant will arrange, prepare agendas and take minutes of these meetings and distribute them to CRIM stakeholders. Arrangements for hosting and chairing meetings are to be agreed with the Client.

Additional meetings between the Client and consultant to be arranged as required.

Information to be provided by the Client

The following information is to be provided by the Client at the Inception Meeting (in either hard or electronic copy (eg CD):

- Draft schedule of CRIM stakeholders and other stakeholders with contact details where known
- Relevant documents such as previous reports and correspondence. These should include, where relevant, the following previously commissioned LCN reports (if the Client does not hold copies they are available for inspection at LCN+ Project Management at LB Camden):
 - Quality Monitoring reports
 - Sector Consultant reports on Priority Strategic Routes
- Major services plant that could influence options, where known
- Schedule of other schemes and/or studies that may affect the Link
- Schedule of current/programmed public or private sector developments that could have a direct or indirect impact on the Link

Programme

The time-scale for completion of the commission is XX weeks from award to issue of the Final Report. The consultant shall submit their programme for agreement within 5 working days of the inception meeting with the Client.

A template programme based on the time periods stated in this brief is attached in Annex 5.

Financial

The target budget for this commission is £XXXX.

Describe invoicing arrangements (suggest invoice as each milestone is achieved)

ANNEX 1

Cycle Route Implementation and Stakeholder Plan (CRISP) Document Specification

The consultant is to set out the CRISP report in accordance with the following part and paragraph numbers unless otherwise agreed with the Client.

The content of the Pre-Crim Report (1.1- 4.1) is indicated thus:



	Part & Para. No	Description	No/size of pages (A4 unless other shown)
		Contents Page – paragraph number, title, page number	1
		Executive Summary – key points from the report including purpose and justification for study	1
	Part 1 - Base information		
	1.1	Introduction, including Link description, road names, Link length (available from LCN+ team at LB Camden), controlling authorities for the Link	2
	1.2	Description of CRISP methodology based on the brief	1
	1.3	Strategic context. Objectives for Link and significant barriers, constraints and opportunities	1
	1.4	A3 Z-folded plan showing the following on appropriate scale grey scale street mapping: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link in light blue • alternative routes in dashed light blue • other LCN+ Links in orange with Link number, including Links connecting into other boroughs with Link number and primary destinations indicated • other LCN routes in dashed orange • TLRN outlined red • borough boundaries in black with adjacent boroughs named 	1A3
	1.5	List of CRIM invitees and other stakeholders to whom Questionnaire issued	#

Part 2 – Summary of data and information gathered			
IMPORTANT – this is to be a narrative summary of existing data only			
	Provide a summary , with tables where appropriate, of the following information where it is relevant to the proposed or any alternative Link:		
2.1	Provisional description of Link Sections/Elements summarising their characteristics	1	
2.2	Key trip generators, including bus and rail stations, educational establishments, major employers, retail centres	1	
2.3	Cycle flow data and significant movements joining/leaving and crossing the Link and, if appropriate, adjacent routes	2	
2.4	Existing conditions for cycling, including cycle specific facilities and problems	1	
2.5	Cycle accident data, noting casualty hotspots	1	
2.6	Motor traffic flow data, including modal split, HGV proportions and peak hour bus flows	2	
2.7	Motor traffic speed data (limits and survey information where available)	1	
2.8	Link and junction capacity and related issues	1	
2.9	Pedestrian amenity related issues	1	
2.10	Reference to and conclusions from historical reports, correspondence and consultations	1	
2.11	Current and proposed highway or related (eg. parks) schemes and/or studies which could affect the Link and alternative routes	2	
2.12	Current and proposed public and private sector developments that will affect the Link and alternative routes (whether by physical works or trip generation)	2	
2.13	Major services plant that could influence treatment options	1	
2.14	Enforcement issues relating to motor traffic and cycling	1	
2.15	<i>Any other miscellaneous information not covered in previous sections</i>	#	
Part 3 – Questionnaire and responses			
3.1	Summary narrative of issues arising from questionnaire responses	1	
3.2	Spreadsheet summarising questionnaire responses (full responses to be included in Appendix B) including matters arising from the questionnaires to be followed up with stakeholders	1A3	
3.3	Copy of questionnaire with covering letter	#	

	Part 4 – Drawing(s) 1:2500 scale with appropriate background street mapping and borough boundaries showing the following:		
	4.1	<p>Existing situation on Link and alternative routes Title: “Existing Situation”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ provisional identification of Sections (and Elements if required) ▪ existing characteristics of Sections including general land use, frontage activity, number of lanes/bus lanes, widths, signalised junctions, parking and loading restrictions, speed limits and speed survey data ▪ Trip generators e.g. schools, leisure facilities and public transport stations and interchanges in close proximity to The Link or alternative routes ▪ main vehicle, cycle and pedestrian movements including HGV proportion and peak hour bus frequency ▪ cycle specific facilities/infrastructure (eg lanes, tracks, ASL’s, crossings, cycle only gaps etc) with widths stated where appropriate ▪ existing problems for cyclists including pinchpoints, discontinuities, narrow tracks, unclear facilities, enforcement etc ▪ cyclist casualty locations using standard referencing diagrams ▪ other LCN+ Links in orange wash with Link number, including Links connecting into other boroughs with Link number and primary destinations indicated ▪ cycle routes as shown on current London Cycle Guides in colour coded wash (except for the Link itself or alternative routes) ▪ TLRN outlined red ▪ borough boundaries in black with adjacent boroughs named ▪ any other relevant location specific information (current or proposed) such as town centre schemes, 20mph zones, traffic calming, homezones, private sector developments etc 	A1 or A0
	4.2	<p>Title: “Recommendations”</p> <p>Show the LCN+ Link in solid line and any alternative routes in dashed line</p> <p>Show the Sections and Elements with boxed descriptions of the recommendations for each using the Section/Element reference.</p>	A1 or A0
	4.3	<p>If necessary, provide supplementary plans clarifying outline recommendations and other relevant supporting information.</p>	As required

Part 5 – Consideration and Summary of Strategy Options and Costs				
		<p>This is the key part of the report which must include a data sheet for each Section or Element, a description of the issues, a photograph to give the context, the strategy options and treatments, budget costs, assessment of each option and reasons for rejection or recommendation:</p> <p>Divide the Link(s) into Sections defined by changes in character. Where a number of different treatments are considered necessary within a Section, sub-divide the Section into Elements.</p> <p>Sections should be numbered and Elements should be lettered.</p>		
		<p>Provide a data sheet for each Section/Element containing the following:</p>		
	5.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ location and reference to identify each section/element ▪ Name of highway authority (or other responsible implementing body eg park authority etc.) ▪ Date of site inspection ▪ A single photograph with description representing the section/element (additional photographs to be provided on the following sheet if considered necessary) ▪ brief description of existing characteristics including land use, frontage activity, widths, cycle facilities, motor traffic and cycle flows, ▪ problems and barriers for cyclists ▪ summary of any consultations with stakeholders, noting support and risks ▪ constraints eg narrow bridge, junction capacity ▪ opportunities eg from new development ▪ brief description of strategy options and proposals for each section/element with budget scheme costs for each option ▪ other comments, but only if relevant, positive or recommendation (including any cross border issues) ▪ recommendations with reasons 	1 each (example provided in Annex 4)	
	5.2	<p>Spread sheet summarising the information shown on the individual data sheets with the addition of advantages and disadvantages of each strategy option considered.</p> <p>Include columns in the spreadsheet for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section/Element Reference ▪ Strategy Option reference ▪ Brief description of option ▪ Benefits 	A3	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Disbenefits ▪ Budget Cost (from Section 6) <p>The recommended options are to be shown in bold and the total costs of the recommended options to be shown at the foot of the table.</p>		
Part 6 - Summary of costs				
	6.1	<p>Spreadsheet showing budget cost estimates of each strategy option, noting if funding available from other sources (eg Section 106 funding from developments)</p> <p>Breakdown into the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Traffic management, Speed Reduction ▪ Lanes, tracks or paths for cyclists ▪ Junction works, including signals ▪ Crossing provision, including signals ▪ Signing and road markings ▪ Other miscellaneous works ▪ Statutory undertakers works ▪ Fees etc. 	A3	
Part 7 - Proposed Programme				
	7.1	<p>A provisional outline programme of the works broken down into feasibility (if required), design, consultation and implementation in financial year.</p> <p>The programme must be agreed with the implementation authorities, i.e. borough (with LB Camden as LCN+ Project Manager) or TfL Area Team.</p>	A4 or A3 as required	
APPENDICES				
	A	<p>Record of CRIM: Summary of the CRIM, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ List of attendees, organisation and position ▪ Description of significant matters arising, ▪ areas of agreement, ▪ significant constraints identified 	3	
	B	Questionnaire responses	#	
	C	Written responses to the Draft CRISP report.	#	
	D	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	#	
	X	<i>Any other relevant supporting information</i>	#	

Notes:

1	# = variable, dependent on input
2	Parts 1, 2, 3 and 4.1 of the CRISP report are to be Parts 1, 2, 3 and 4.1 of the pre-CRIM report, revised as necessary
3	Font for text to normally be Arial 12 point.

CRISP generic brief – Version 2



LCN+ Cycle Route Implementation and Stakeholder Plan (CRISP)

Project Brief

Items in italics to be completed by the Client.

Introduction

Describe the Link location and broad context in terms of land use, road traffic and cycling and identify any specific relevant reports or other information to be taken into account.

Purpose of Commission

The purpose is to undertake a systematic review of the existing conditions for cycling on Link number XX, taking full account of local knowledge, constraints and concerns. Route alignment, issues, opportunities and constraints (physical and institutional) are to be considered in conjunction with stakeholders.

Recommendations for a route strategy and practical measures most likely to be successful in attracting and maintaining substantial cycle flows will be made. Budget cost estimates and a provisional outline programme will be prepared.

Recommendations could include detailed technical feasibility studies, modelling, surveys etc. which in themselves are not part of this brief.

The Final CRISP report is strategic and should avoid detailed consideration of treatments which will follow on from the CRISP study during design development.

London Cycling Design Standards

When considering strategy and treatment options, the content of the London Cycling Design Standards (TfL, May 2005) is to be taken into account. The principles of providing continuous, safe and comfortable conditions for cycling, with minimal delay to cycle journey times should be followed.

Opportunities and Constraints

Constraints including geographical/landscape barriers, link and junction capacity and competing priorities for road space must be allowed for. In assessing options and costs and making recommendations the requirements and practicalities for implementation, maintenance and enforcement are to be taken into account.

Outputs

The following documents are to be prepared in accordance with the specification in Annex 1 to this brief.

- Pre-CRIM Report
- Record of CRIM



- Draft CRISP Report
- Final CRISP Report

Reports shall be issued to CRIM Stakeholders as set out in the brief.

Appropriate procedures should be in place for checking and quality assurance of reports.

Paper copies should be provided. Provision of copies of reports electronically (e.g. on CD) should be arranged between the client and consultant at the Inception meeting and with CRIM Stakeholders (for Draft and Final CRISP Reports at the CRIM stage)



Methodology / Sequence

Stage 1 – Preparation, data collection, summary and dissemination

- Inception Meeting with Client to discuss brief and agree programme. Client to hand over information to consultant (see list below under 'information to be provided by client')
- Finalise a schedule of CRIM and Other Stakeholders (see below for guidance) with contact details (Client to prepare draft schedule)
- Issue questionnaire to Other Stakeholders within 1 week of the start of the commission with a deadline for responses of a maximum of 5 weeks from date of issue (See **Annex 2** for example letter and questionnaire).
- Commence liaison with CRIM stakeholders to inform them of the study and suggest and agree dates for the CRIM
- Obtain available data on cycle flows (including joining/leaving and crossing the Link), and cycle accidents (last 3 years).
If cycle flow information is not available from the Client, the LCN+ Project Management office at London Borough of Camden may be able to provide appropriate data. Simple counts may be necessary to provide basic existing cycle flow data if pre-existing information is not available. Requirements and method for collecting data should be agreed with the client.
- Obtain available data on motor vehicle flows, turning movements, speeds, HGV and bus flows/proportions, link and junction capacity
- Review pedestrian amenity on the Link and pedestrian/cycle interface issues, such as footway cycling concerns
- Record existing characteristics on the Link including:
 - Major trip generators, including bus and rail stations, educational establishments, major employers, retail centres, hospitals and leisure uses
 - broad land use, frontage activity, bus stops, parking and loading facilities and restrictions
 - carriageway, footway and other widths, relevant highway boundaries
 - existing facilities for cyclists including extent and widths of lanes, tracks and paths (noting whether on or off-carriageway), Advanced Stop Lines, crossing facilities, cycle exemptions from traffic restrictions, ease of access on and off the Link
 - existing problems for cyclists including pinchpoints, discontinuities, deviations, narrow tracks, poor surface, ponding, unclear facilities, legal restrictions, enforcement issues, (for examples see LCDS 1.1.22)
- Review and summarise the information provided by the Client (see list below).
- Agree with the client alternative routes to be studied, taking into account:
 - views of CRIM stakeholders
 - responses to questionnaires
 - routes shown on London Cycle Guide maps
- Provisional division of Links into **Sections** of similar characteristics defined by factors such as traffic flow, speed limit/recorded speeds, gradient, land use, frontage activity (including parking and loading), corridor/carriageway width with the objective of providing consistent solutions on each **Section**



- Prepare Pre-CRIM Report. This forms the basis for Parts 1.1 to 4.1 of the Draft CRISP Report
- Issue the pre-CRIM report and the formal invitation to the CRIM to CRIM Stakeholders at least 2 weeks before the CRIM (the dates of the CRIM and pre-CRIM meeting should have been informally agreed with CRIM Stakeholders in advance of this date)
See **Annex 3** for an example Pre-CRIM Report issue letter
- During the week preceding the CRIM, hold a pre-CRIM meeting* to agree the scope, practical arrangements (e.g. meeting point, lunch stop and a timetable for the day) for the CRIM with the Client and CRIM invitees.
A practical approach to the timing and duration of the pre-CRIM meeting is required to accommodate voluntary sector attendants. A meeting late in the afternoon of no more than two hours duration is suggested.
*Subject to the agreement of the CRIM Stakeholders (excluding CCE), a pre-CRIM meeting is not necessary if the objectives of the meeting can be met by other means.

Stage 2 – Cycle Route Inspection Meeting (CRIM)

- Consultant to host the CRIM. Arrangements for the day must be made in advance with the CRIM Stakeholders.
- The CRIM should not take place without the attendance of a representative of the relevant highway authority(ies). This would preferably be the borough cycle officer and a senior officer from the highways department
- Representatives from neighbouring/adjoining authorities should be invited to attend the CRIM at the relevant location (s)
- All reasonable effort should be made to ensure that a representative from LCC and/or CTC or local cyclists' stakeholder groups attends the CRIM.
- The CRIM should take place on bicycles or on foot.
A suggestion is to first cycle the whole Link from one end to the other then return along the Link, stopping to consider specific locations. It is desirable for at least part of the CRIM to take place during a weekday peak period.
- Issue a "Record of CRIM" to all invitees within 2 weeks of it taking place (This to form Appendix A to the Final CRISP Report)

Stage 3 – Prepare & issue Draft CRISP Report (See Annex 1 for format and detailed content)

- Refer to the London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS)
- Review the information obtained during Stages 1 and 2 and develop strategy options for each **Section/Element** in conjunction with the Client, involving Other Stakeholders as appropriate
(Refer to LCDS Figure 2.3 for guidance for on-carriageway options)
- Assess the strategy options in terms of their advantages, disadvantages, and feasibility.
- Where options could take a long period to implement, short term improvements for cycling could also be recommended.
- Prepare budget costs for options
- Recommend preferred option with reasons



- Allocate the recommended options to a programme year
(The need for close liaison between the consultant and highway authority and LCN+ project management team (LB Camden) regarding budget costs and outline programme is emphasised to produce realistic and achievable outcomes)
- Compile Draft CRISP Report
- Issue Draft CRISP Report to CRIM stakeholders within 4 weeks of the CRIM, with deadline for comments of 2 weeks
- Arrange Review of Draft CRISP Report meeting with CRIM and any other appropriate stakeholders within 1 week of issue of the report
nb All significant issues should have been discussed prior to and reflected in the Draft CRISP Report. The purpose of this meeting is to consider minor amendments to report content and the inclusion of additional relevant information.

Stage 4 – Prepare and Issue Final CRISP Report

- Revise the Draft CRISP Report to produce the Final CRISP Report taking into account comments received on the draft report and matters raised at the Draft Report Review meeting
- Issue the Final CRISP Report to the CRIM Stakeholders (two copies to the Client) within 2 weeks of the Review of Draft CRISP Report meeting referred to in Stage 3



Stakeholders

The Stakeholders will be identified by the Client during Stage 1 and will be split into two groups:

1. **The CRIM Stakeholders:**
 - Highway authority representative i.e.
 - the borough cycling officer and senior highways department officer (and/or leisure/parks department where appropriate) for Links on borough roads **or**
 - TfL Area Team officer for Links on TLRN
 - The borough cycle officer for Links on the TLRN
 - London Borough of Camden LCN+ Project Management team
 - TfL Area Team for Links on borough roads that interface or affect the Transport for London Road Network
 - London Cycling Campaign local representative and/or other local cycling group representatives such as Cyclists Touring Club (CTC)
(LCC borough group contacts can be found by following the link to “borough groups” on the LCC website at www.lcc.org.uk)
 - Sustrans - where the route is on or interfaces with a National Cycle Network route or where a local Sustrans supporter has been identified (Sustrans Head Office to liaise with LCN+ project management on this matter)
 - TfL Cycling Centre of Excellence (note: CCE will not normally attend CRIMs but should be invited and be issued the pre-CRIM Report for information and monitoring purposes)
 - Representatives from neighbouring/adjoining authorities (e.g. boroughs, TfL, parks department etc.) should be invited to attend the CRIM at the relevant location (s)

2. **Other Stakeholders** (who will be sent the Questionnaire). This list of examples may not be exhaustive:
 - ward councillors along the Link
 - lead member for environment
 - head of borough planning department
 - local Police,
 - TfL London Buses (Bus Priority Projects and Bus Operations)
 - TfL signals (NID),
 - Cycling group representatives in neighbouring borough (s)
 - London Transport Users Committee (LTUC)
 - town centre managers,
 - educational establishments,
 - major hospitals
 - sports stadia
 - residents groups,
 - non-cycling user groups (e.g. representatives of mobility impaired or pedestrians)
 - petitioners,

Street Management



- major employers,
- traders representatives,
- affected landowners (e.g. Royal Parks Authority, British Waterways, Corporation of London where open spaces affected are under their control (e.g. Epping Forest))



Meetings

The following meetings (excluding the CRIM) should be allowed for:

- Inception meeting
- Pre-CRIM meeting
- Review of Draft CRISP Report meeting

The consultant will arrange, prepare agendas and take minutes of these meetings and distribute them to CRIM stakeholders. Arrangements for hosting meetings are to be agreed with the Client. The client will chair all meetings.

Additional meetings between the Client and consultant to be arranged as required.

Information to be provided by the Client at the Inception Meeting

The following information is to be provided by the Client at the Inception meeting (in either hard or electronic copy (e.g. CD)):

- Draft schedule of CRIM stakeholders and Other Stakeholders, with contact details where known
- Copies or extracts of existing relevant documents such as previous reports and correspondence.

These should include, where relevant, the following previously commissioned LCN reports (if the Client does not hold copies they are available for inspection at LCN+ Project Management at LB Camden):

- Quality Monitoring reports
- Sector Consultant reports on Priority Strategic Routes
- Major services plant that could influence options
- Schedule of other schemes and/or studies that may affect the Link
- Schedule of current/programmed public or private sector developments that could have a direct or indirect impact on the Link

Programme

The time-scale for completion of the commission is XX weeks from award to issue of the Final CRISP Report. The consultant shall submit their programme for agreement within 5 working days of the Inception meeting.

An indicative programme based on the time periods stated in this brief is attached in Annex 5. The minimum periods stated in this brief may be extended by agreement with the client.

Financial

The target budget for this commission is £XXXX.

Describe invoicing arrangements (it is suggested that invoices are accepted as each milestone is achieved)

ANNEX 1

Cycle Route Implementation and Stakeholder Plan (CRISP) Document Specification

The consultant is to set out the CRISP report in accordance with the following part and paragraph numbers unless otherwise agreed with the Client.

The content of the Pre-Crim Report (1.1- 4.1) is indicated thus:



	Part & Para. No	Description	No/size of pages (A4 unless other shown)
		Contents Page – paragraph number, title, page number	1
		Executive Summary – key points from the report including (use sub-headings) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Route alignment (alternatives considered and reasoning for preferred route) • Major barriers to cycling and proposed actions • Major opportunities for cycling and proposed actions • Unresolved matters of contention and process for future resolution • Total broad cost estimate for implementing recommendations 	#
		Part 1 - Base information	
	1.1	Introduction, including route and primary destination (s) (see LCDS Fig 6.2), Link description, road names, Link length (available from LCN+ team at LB Camden), controlling authorities for the Link	2
	1.2	Description of CRISP methodology based on the brief	1
	1.3	Strategic context. Objectives for the Link and significant barriers, constraints and opportunities	1

1.4	<p>A3 Z-folded plan showing the following on appropriate scale grey scale street mapping:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link in light blue • alternative routes in dashed light blue • other LCN+ Links in orange with Link number, including Links connecting into other boroughs with Link number and primary destinations indicated • other LCN routes in dashed orange • TLRN outlined red • borough boundaries in black with adjacent boroughs named <p>Supplementary information to aid understanding of the route context could include a map extract of the London Cycle Guide with the Link to be studied marked on it</p>	#A3	
1.5	<p>List of CRIM invitees</p> <p>List of Other Stakeholders to whom Questionnaire was issued</p>	#	
<p>Part 2 – Summary of data and information gathered IMPORTANT –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • this is to be a summary of existing data only • all sections to be completed (enter none or n/a as applicable) 			
	Provide a summary , with tables where appropriate, of the following information where it is relevant to the proposed or any alternative Link:		
2.1	Provisional description of Link Sections/Elements summarising their characteristics	1	
2.2	Key trip generators, including bus and rail stations, educational establishments, major employers, retail centres	1	
2.3	Cycle flow data and significant movements joining/leaving and crossing the Link and, if appropriate, adjacent routes	2	
2.4	Existing conditions for cycling, including cycle specific facilities and problems	1	
2.5	Cycle accident data, noting casualty hotspots	1	
2.6	Motor traffic flow data, including modal split, HGV proportions and peak hour bus flows	2	
2.7	Motor traffic speed data (limits and survey information where available)	1	
2.8	Link and junction capacity and related issues	1	
2.9	Pedestrian amenity related issues	1	
2.10	Precis of and conclusions from historic reports, correspondence and consultations	1	
2.11	Current and proposed highway or related (e.g. parks) schemes and/or studies which could affect the Link and alternative routes	2	

	2.12	Current and proposed public and private sector developments that will affect the Link and alternative routes (whether by physical works or trip generation)	2	
	2.13	Major services plant that could influence treatment options	1	
	2.14	Enforcement issues relating to motor traffic and cycling	1	
	2.15	<i>Any other miscellaneous information not covered in previous sections</i>	#	
Part 3 – Questionnaire and responses				
	3.1	Summary narrative of issues arising from questionnaire responses	1	
	3.2	Spreadsheet summarising questionnaire responses (full responses to be included in Appendix B) including matters arising from the questionnaires to be followed up with stakeholders	1A3	
	3.3	Copy of questionnaire with covering letter	#	
Part 4 – Drawing(s)				
<i>1:2500 scale with appropriate background street mapping and borough boundaries showing the following:</i>				
	4.1	Existing situation on Link and alternative routes Title: “Existing Situation” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ provisional identification of Sections (and Elements if required) ▪ existing characteristics of Sections including general land use, frontage activity, number of lanes/bus lanes, widths, signalised junctions, parking and loading restrictions, speed limits and speed survey data ▪ Trip generators e.g. schools, leisure facilities and public transport stations and interchanges in close proximity to The Link or alternative routes ▪ main motor vehicle, cycle and pedestrian movements including HGV proportion and peak hour bus frequency ▪ cycle specific facilities/infrastructure (e.g. lanes, tracks, ASL’s, crossings, cycle only gaps etc) with widths stated where appropriate ▪ existing problems for cyclists including pinchpoints, discontinuities, narrow tracks, unclear facilities, enforcement etc ▪ cyclist casualty locations using standard referencing diagrams ▪ other LCN+ Links in orange wash with Link number, including Links connecting into other 	A1 or A0	

		<p>boroughs with Link number and primary destinations indicated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ cycle routes as shown on current London Cycle Guides in colour coded wash (except for the Link itself or alternative routes) ▪ TLRN outlined red ▪ borough boundaries in black with adjacent boroughs named ▪ any other relevant location specific information (current or proposed) such as town centre schemes, 20mph zones, traffic calming, homezones, private sector developments etc 		
	4.2	<p>Title: "Recommendations"</p> <p>Show the LCN+ Link in solid line and any alternative routes in dashed line</p> <p>Show the Sections and Elements with boxed descriptions of the recommendations for each using the Section/Element reference.</p>	A1 or A0	
	4.3	<p>If necessary, provide supplementary plans clarifying outline recommendations and other relevant supporting information.</p>	As required	
Part 5 – Consideration and Summary of Strategy Options and Costs				
		<p>This is the key part of the report which must include a data sheet for each Section or Element, a description of the issues, a photograph to give the context, the strategy options and treatments, budget costs, assessment of each option and reasons for rejection or recommendation:</p> <p>Divide the Link(s) into Sections defined by changes in character. Where a number of different treatments are considered necessary within a Section, sub-divide the Section into Elements.</p> <p>Sections should be numbered and Elements should be lettered.</p>		
		<p>Provide a data sheet for each Section/Element containing the following:</p>		
	5.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Location and reference to identify each section/element (e.g. 4b) ▪ Name of highway authority (or other responsible implementing body e.g. park authority etc.) ▪ Date of site inspection ▪ A single photograph with description representing the section/element (additional photographs to be provided on the following sheet (s) as required) ▪ Brief description of existing characteristics including land use, frontage activity, widths, cycle facilities, motor traffic and cycle flows, 	1 each (example provided in Annex 4)	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brief description of problems and barriers for cyclists ▪ Summarise issues raised by stakeholders, noting support, concerns and risks ▪ Constraints e.g. narrow bridge, junction capacity ▪ Opportunities e.g. from new development ▪ Description of strategy options and proposals for each section/element with budget scheme costs for each option ▪ Other comments, but only if relevant, positive or recommendation (including any cross border issues) ▪ Recommendations with reasons for choice and why other options not recommended 		
	5.2	<p>Spread sheet summarising the information shown on the individual data sheets with the addition of advantages and disadvantages of each strategy option considered.</p> <p>Include columns in the spreadsheet for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section/Element Reference ▪ Strategy Option reference ▪ Brief description of option ▪ Benefits ▪ Disbenefits ▪ Budget Cost (from Part 6) <p>The recommended options are to be shown in bold and the total costs of the recommended options to be shown at the foot of the table.</p>	A3	
Part 6 - Summary of costs				
	6.1	<p>Spreadsheet showing budget cost estimates of each strategy option, noting if funding available from external sources (e.g. Section 106 funding from developments). See guidance in LCDS 7.13.</p> <p>Breakdown into the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Traffic management, Speed Reduction ▪ Lanes, tracks or paths for cyclists ▪ Junction works, including signals ▪ Crossing provision, including signals ▪ Signing and road markings ▪ Other miscellaneous works ▪ Statutory undertakers works ▪ Fees etc. ▪ Preliminaries (including traffic management during construction) 	A3	

	Part 7 - Proposed Programme		
	7.1	A provisional outline programme for implementing each of the report recommendations broken down into feasibility , design, consultation and implementation in financial year. The programme must be agreed with the implementation authorities, i.e. borough (guidance available from LB Camden LCN+ Project Manager) or TfL Area Team.	A4 or A3 as required
		APPENDICES	
	A	Record of CRIM: Summary of the CRIM, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ List of attendees, organisation and position ▪ Description of significant matters arising, ▪ areas of agreement, ▪ significant constraints identified 	3
	B	Questionnaire responses	#
	C	Written responses to the Draft CRISP report.	#
	D	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 (these could be incorporated in the LCN+ Asset Management Initiative programme)	#
	X	<i>Any other relevant supporting information</i>	#

Notes:

1	# = variable, dependent on input
2	Parts 1, 2, 3 and 4.1 of the CRISP report are to be Parts 1, 2, 3 and 4.1 of the pre-CRIM report, revised as necessary
3	Font for text to normally be Arial 12 point.

APPENDIX B

Questions used for detailed review
of each CRISP report

Questions used for review of final CRISP reports – July 2006

1	Title of report being reviewed:	
2	LCN+ Link number (s):	
3	Commissioning authority:	
4	Report prepared by:	
5	Date report published:	
	<i>General points</i>	
6	Which version of the CRISP brief applies and is this clear in the report? (If the brief is included is it the correct one ?)	
7	Has the CRISP brief process been closely followed?	
8	Where the CRISP process has not been closely followed, has the spirit of the process been applied?	
9	Comment on whether the report presents a strategic position (as required by the brief) or whether unnecessary detail is included.	
10	Is there evidence that the report takes into account scheme feasibility, maintenance and enforcement in the consideration of options and recommendations?	
11	Has the completing body taken an objective view throughout the CRISP process?	
12	Does the Final CRISP report follow the Annex 1 document specification, including part numbers and titles, paragraph numbers and number and size of pages?	

13	Is there reasonable adherence of the report to LCDS (particularly where LCDS is referenced in the brief)?	
14	Comment on the time taken to complete the study, whether this was reasonably compliant with the indicative programme, and whether the reason for any delays are clear and justified.	
	<i>Detailed analysis of Final CRISP report</i>	
15	Contents page: is one included and is it clear?	
16	Executive Summary: has one been provided and are the requirements of the brief included ?	
17	Data collection: Has cycle and motor vehicle flow information been provided ?	
18	Data collection (2): have pedestrian interface issues been adequately considered ?	
19	Data collection (3): Have the characteristics of the link been appropriately identified in terms of major trip generators, land use and frontage activity, relevant widths and boundaries, existing facilities and problems for cyclists ?	
20	Stakeholders: Is a full list of CRIM and other stakeholders identified? Identify any potential omissions and where possible ascertain the reasons for this.	
21	Questionnaires: Have these been circulated to all identified 'other stakeholders', using the correct pro-forma and have all responses been accurately reported? Have responses been included in Appendix B ?	
22	Route alignment considerations: Have alternative route options raised by CRIM stakeholders in responses to questionnaires and current routes shown on London Cycle Guide maps been appropriately considered ?	

23	Route Sections: Assess and comment on whether the link or links appear to have been correctly divided into the required distinct sections.	
24	Highway authority: Has the relevant highway authority (or authorities) attended the CRIM?	
25	Other authority representation: Have neighbouring/adjoining authorities been appropriately represented?	
26	Cycle Group representation: Have these been appropriately represented? Where there has been no representation from a local cycle group, note the reason for non-attendance if provided.	
27	CRIM methodology: Consider whether the correct methodology for carrying out a CRIM has taken place i.e. has it been undertaken on foot or by bicycle and has the link been ridden/walked for the full length by all attendees prior to returning along the route and stopping to consider specific locations along the route (this is a suggestion in the brief)?	
28	Record of CRIM: Has this been included as Appendix A to the final CRISP report? Has this record been issued to all original invitees within the required two week period? Verify if those unable to attend the CRIM for any reason have been forwarded the Record of CRIM and note if comments have been made in lieu of attendance.	
29	Strategy options: Review the strategy options developed for each section or element of a route on data sheets and assess whether this process has effectively incorporated the information generated in Stages 1 and 2. Note how much involvement there has been with client and appropriate stakeholders in developing the options, whether cycling growth has been taken into account and if LCDS has been used effectively (LCDS Fig 2.3 provides guidance that report compilers are referred to).	

30	Strategy options (2): Confirm to what extent the report compilers have assessed their identified strategy options in terms of advantages and disadvantages. Comment on the evidence provided in support of this.	
31	Preferred option: Review the suggested preferred option and evidence in support of the recommendation. Consider whether this recommendation follows logically from the earlier assessment of strategy options and information collated from stages 1 and 2. Where the recommendations are at odds with the stated views of a CRIM stakeholder, what evidence for the conclusion reached has been provided? Where recommended options would require long term implementation, have short term improvements for cycling on the route been recommended?	
32	Drawings: Have separate drawings been provided showing existing characteristics and recommendations? Comment on the quality of the information shown.	
33	Data sheet summary spreadsheet: Has the spreadsheet summarising information on the data sheets been provided as described ?	
34	Summary of costs: has the spreadsheet showing the breakdown of budget costs been provided as described ?	
35	Proposed programme : Has a provisional programme been provided ? Consider whether recommendations appear to be reasonably achievable within the programme year they are allocated to, based on complexity and scale of the recommendation.	
36	Review of draft CRISP report meeting: Has this review meeting taken place at the required time and with CRIM attendees/other appropriate stakeholders present?	
37	Final report: does the final CRISP report appear to incorporate comments made on the draft report and any further issues raised at the draft report review meeting?	

	<i>Additional housekeeping points (good practice but not an explicit requirement of the brief)</i>	
38	Does the final version of the CRISP report have a consistent date and reference number appearing on the front of the report, on a QA sheet and on the footer on each page (including data sheets)? And do the dates and amendment references of earlier versions appear on the QA sheet?	
39	Are the pages numbered? (This makes it much easier for consultees to comment on drafts.)	
40	Are the tables and drawings numbered in a logical way that makes them easy to find and refer to? (LCDS index page iii is an example of good practice in this respect.)	
41	Does incorrect use of grammar and punctuation make the report hard to read or give rise to ambiguity?	
42	Is there a sheet setting out key dates including dates for consultant's appointment, issue of questionnaires and deadline for return, issue of pre-CRIM report, the CRIM itself, issue of the CRIM meeting note, issue of draft CRISP report and deadline for comments, the CRISP review meeting and the issue of the final report?	

APPENDIX C

CRISP generic brief – suggested Version 3



[DRAFT VERSION 3]

LCN+ Cycle Route Implementation and Stakeholder Plan (CRISP) (changes from Version 2 are highlighted in red)

Project Brief

Items in italics to be completed by the Client.

Introduction

Describe the Link location and broad context in terms of land use, road traffic and cycling and identify any specific relevant reports or other information to be taken into account.

Purpose of Commission

The purpose is to undertake a systematic review of the existing conditions for cycling on Link number XX, taking full account of local knowledge, constraints and concerns. Route alignment, issues, opportunities and constraints (physical and institutional) are to be considered in conjunction with stakeholders.

Recommendations for a route strategy and practical measures most likely to be successful in attracting and maintaining substantial cycle flows will be made. Budget cost estimates and a provisional outline programme will be prepared.

Recommendations could include detailed technical feasibility studies, modelling, surveys etc. which in themselves are not part of this brief.

The Final CRISP report is strategic and should avoid detailed consideration of treatments which will follow on from the CRISP study during design development. **It should however include a sufficiently thorough examination of any exceptionally difficult sections to establish that at least one acceptable solution exists, i.e. that the inclusion of the section is not a fatal flaw in the overall route choice.**

London Cycling Design Standards

When considering strategy and treatment options, the content of the London Cycling Design Standards (TfL, May 2005) is to be taken into account. The principles of providing continuous, safe and comfortable conditions for cycling, with minimal delay to cycle journey times should be followed.

Opportunities and Constraints

Constraints including geographical/landscape barriers, link and junction capacity and competing priorities for road space must be allowed for. In assessing options and costs and making recommendations the requirements and practicalities for implementation, maintenance and enforcement are to be taken into account.



Outputs

The following documents are to be prepared in accordance with the specification in Annex 1 to this brief.

- Pre-CRIM Report
- Record of CRIM
- Draft CRISP Report
- Final CRISP Report

Reports shall be issued to CRIM Stakeholders as set out in the brief.

Appropriate procedures should be in place for checking and quality assurance of reports.

Paper copies should be provided. Provision of copies of reports electronically (e.g. on CD) should be arranged between the client and consultant at the Inception meeting and with CRIM Stakeholders (for Draft and Final CRISP Reports at the CRIM stage)



Methodology / Sequence

Stage 1 – Preparation, data collection, summary and dissemination

- Inception Meeting with Client to discuss brief and agree programme. Client to hand over information to consultant (see list below under 'information to be provided by client')
- Finalise a schedule of CRIM and Other Stakeholders (see below for guidance) with contact details (Client to prepare draft schedule)
- Issue questionnaire **and route map** to Other Stakeholders within 1 week of the start of the commission with a deadline for responses of a maximum of 5 weeks from date of issue (See **Annex 2** for example letter and questionnaire).
- Commence liaison with CRIM stakeholders to inform them of the study and suggest and agree dates for the CRIM
- Obtain available data on cycle flows (including joining/leaving and crossing the Link), and cycle accidents (last 3 years).
If cycle flow information is not available from the Client, the LCN+ Project Management office at London Borough of Camden may be able to provide appropriate data. Simple counts may be necessary to provide basic existing cycle flow data if pre-existing information is not available. Requirements and method for collecting data should be agreed with the client.
- Obtain available data on motor vehicle flows, turning movements, speeds, HGV and bus flows/proportions, link and junction capacity
- Review pedestrian amenity on the Link and pedestrian/cycle interface issues, such as footway cycling concerns
- Record existing characteristics on the Link including:
 - Major trip generators, including **rail stations used by significant numbers of cyclists**, educational establishments, major employers, retail centres, hospitals and leisure uses
 - broad land use, frontage activity, bus stops, parking and loading facilities and restrictions
 - carriageway, footway and other widths, relevant highway boundaries
 - existing facilities for cyclists including extent and widths of lanes, tracks and paths (noting whether on or off-carriageway), Advanced Stop Lines, crossing facilities, cycle exemptions from traffic restrictions, ease of access on and off the Link
 - existing problems for cyclists including pinchpoints, discontinuities, deviations, narrow tracks, poor surface, ponding, unclear facilities, legal restrictions, enforcement issues, (for examples see LCDS 1.1.22)
- Review and summarise the information provided by the Client (see list below).
- Agree with the client alternative routes to be studied, taking into account:
 - views of CRIM stakeholders
 - responses to questionnaires
 - routes shown on London Cycle Guide maps
- Provisional division of Links into **Sections** of similar characteristics defined by factors such as traffic flow, speed limit/recorded speeds, gradient, land



use, frontage activity (including parking and loading), corridor/carriageway width with the objective of providing consistent solutions on each **Section**

- Prepare Pre-CRIM Report. This forms the basis for Parts 1.1 to 4.1 of the Draft CRISP Report
- Issue the pre-CRIM report and the formal invitation to the CRIM to CRIM Stakeholders at least 2 weeks before the CRIM (the dates of the CRIM and pre-CRIM meeting should have been informally agreed with CRIM Stakeholders in advance of this date).
- **Where the local cycling group has agreed to carry out a pre-CRIM ride and produce a written note, the pre-CRIM report should be issued at least 3 weeks before the CRIM**
- See **Annex 3** for an example Pre-CRIM Report issue letter
- During the week preceding the CRIM, hold a pre-CRIM meeting* to agree the scope, practical arrangements (e.g. meeting point, lunch stop and a timetable for the day) for the CRIM with the Client and CRIM invitees. A practical approach to the timing and duration of the pre-CRIM meeting is required to accommodate voluntary sector attendants. A meeting late in the afternoon of no more than two hours duration is suggested.
*Subject to the agreement of the CRIM Stakeholders (excluding CCE), a pre-CRIM meeting is not necessary if the objectives of the meeting can be met by other means.

Stage 2 – Cycle Route Inspection Meeting (CRIM)

- Consultant to host the CRIM. Arrangements for the day must be made in advance with the CRIM Stakeholders.
- The CRIM should not take place without the attendance of a representative of the relevant highway authority(ies). This would preferably be the borough cycle officer and a senior officer from the highways department
- Representatives from neighbouring/adjoining authorities should be invited to attend the CRIM at the relevant location (s)
- All reasonable effort should be made to ensure that a representative from LCC and/or CTC or local cyclists' stakeholder groups attends the CRIM.
- The CRIM should take place **on bicycles (or, in exceptional circumstances and with stakeholder agreement, on foot)**.
A suggestion is to first cycle the whole Link from one end to the other then return along the Link, stopping to consider specific locations. It is desirable for at least part of the CRIM to take place during a weekday peak period.
- Issue a **draft** "Record of CRIM" to all invitees within 2 weeks of it taking place, **and take account of any feedback received** (This to form Appendix A to the Final CRISP Report)

Stage 3 – Prepare & issue Draft CRISP Report (See Annex 1 for format and detailed content)

- Refer to the London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS)
- Review the information obtained during Stages 1 and 2 and develop strategy options for each **Section/Element** in conjunction with the Client, involving Other Stakeholders as appropriate



(Refer to LCDS Figure 2.3 for guidance for on-carriageway options)

- Assess the strategy options in terms of their advantages, disadvantages, and feasibility.
- Where options could take a long period to implement, short term improvements for cycling could also be recommended.
- Prepare budget costs for options
- Recommend preferred option with reasons
- Allocate the recommended options to a programme year
(The need for close liaison between the consultant and highway authority and LCN+ project management team (LB Camden) regarding budget costs and outline programme is emphasised to produce realistic and achievable outcomes)
- Compile Draft CRISP Report
- Issue Draft CRISP Report to CRIM stakeholders within 4 weeks of the CRIM, with deadline for comments of 2 weeks
- Arrange Review of Draft CRISP Report meeting with CRIM and any other appropriate stakeholders within 1 week of issue of the report
nb All significant issues should have been discussed prior to and reflected in the Draft CRISP Report. The purpose of this meeting is to consider minor amendments to report content and the inclusion of additional relevant information.

Stage 4 – Prepare and Issue Final CRISP Report

- Revise the Draft CRISP Report to produce the Final CRISP Report taking into account comments received on the draft report and matters raised at the Draft Report Review meeting
- Issue the Final CRISP Report to the CRIM Stakeholders (two copies to the Client) within 2 weeks of the Review of Draft CRISP Report meeting referred to in Stage 3



Stakeholders

The Stakeholders will be identified by the Client during Stage 1 and will be split into two groups:

1. **The CRIM Stakeholders:**
 - Highway authority representative i.e.
 - the borough cycling officer and senior highways department officer (and/or leisure/parks department where appropriate) for Links on borough roads **or**
 - TfL Area Team officer for Links on TLRN
 - The borough cycle officer for Links on the TLRN
 - London Borough of Camden LCN+ Project Management team
 - TfL Area Team for Links on borough roads that interface or affect the Transport for London Road Network
 - London Cycling Campaign local representative and/or other local cycling group representatives such as Cyclists Touring Club (CTC)
(LCC borough group contacts can be found by following the link to “borough groups” on the LCC website at www.lcc.org.uk)
 - Sustrans - where the route is on or interfaces with a National Cycle Network route or where a local Sustrans supporter has been identified (Sustrans Head Office to liaise with LCN+ project management on this matter)
 - TfL Cycling Centre of Excellence (note: CCE will not normally attend CRIMs but should be invited and be issued the pre-CRIM Report for information and monitoring purposes)
 - Representatives from neighbouring/adjoining authorities (e.g. boroughs, TfL, parks department etc.) should be invited to attend the CRIM at the relevant location (s)

2. **Other Stakeholders** (who will be sent the Questionnaire). This list of examples may not be exhaustive:
 - ward councillors along the Link
 - lead member for environment
 - head of borough planning department
 - local Police,
 - TfL London Buses (Bus Priority Projects and Bus Operations)
 - TfL signals (NID),
 - Cycling group representatives in neighbouring borough (s)
 - London Transport Users Committee (LTUC)
 - town centre managers,
 - educational establishments,
 - major hospitals
 - sports stadia
 - residents groups,
 - non-cycling user groups (e.g. representatives of mobility impaired or pedestrians)
 - petitioners,

Street Management



- major employers,
- traders representatives,
- affected landowners (e.g. Royal Parks Authority, British Waterways, Corporation of London where open spaces affected are under their control (e.g. Epping Forest))



Meetings

The following meetings (excluding the CRIM) should be allowed for:

- Inception meeting
- Pre-CRIM meeting
- Review of Draft CRISP Report meeting

The consultant will arrange, prepare agendas and take minutes of these meetings and distribute them to CRIM stakeholders. Arrangements for hosting meetings are to be agreed with the Client. The client will chair all meetings.

Additional meetings between the Client and consultant to be arranged as required.

Information to be provided by the Client at the Inception Meeting

The following information is to be provided by the Client at the Inception meeting (in either hard or electronic copy (e.g. CD)):

- Draft schedule of CRIM stakeholders and Other Stakeholders, with contact details where known
- Copies or extracts of existing relevant documents such as previous reports and correspondence.

These should include, where relevant, the following previously commissioned LCN reports (if the Client does not hold copies they are available for inspection at LCN+ Project Management at LB Camden):

- Quality Monitoring reports
- Sector Consultant reports on Priority Strategic Routes
- Major services plant that could influence options
- Schedule of other schemes and/or studies that may affect the Link
- Schedule of current/programmed public or private sector developments that could have a direct or indirect impact on the Link

Programme

The time-scale for completion of the commission is XX weeks from award to issue of the Final CRISP Report. The consultant shall submit their programme for agreement within 5 working days of the Inception meeting.

An indicative programme based on the time periods stated in this brief is attached in Annex 5. The minimum periods stated in this brief may be extended by agreement with the client.

Financial

The target budget for this commission is £XXXX.

Describe invoicing arrangements (it is suggested that invoices are accepted as each milestone is achieved)

ANNEX 1

Cycle Route Implementation and Stakeholder Plan (CRISP) Document Specification

The consultant is to set out the CRISP report in accordance with the following part and **sub-section** numbers unless otherwise agreed with the Client.

Individual paragraphs will be numbered as an extension of the relevant sub-section e.g. 1.1.2. All pages will be numbered sequentially, and will carry a standard footer including the revision letter applicable to that version of the report. All maps will carry a scale and give the drawing size at which this applies, e.g. "1:2500 at A0 size" ("NTS" is not acceptable).

The content of the Pre-Crim Report (**sub-sections 1.1-4.1**) is indicated thus:



	Part & Sub-section No	Description	No/size of pages (A4 unless other shown)	
		Flysheet – Report title to include LCN+ Link number and concise title indicating location of Link, as well as commissioning authority, report author and date	1	
		Document history listing key programme dates in the brief and dates actually achieved, the document reference number/amendment letter for version issued at each stage, plus any other information required by the design organisation's quality management system.	1	
		Contents Page – give number and title for each part and sub-section, with the page number for each	1	
		Executive Summary – key points from the report including (use sub-headings) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Route alignment (alternatives considered and reasoning for preferred route) including reference to overall route plan at 1.3 Major barriers to cycling and proposed actions Major opportunities for cycling and proposed actions Unresolved matters of contention and process for future resolution Total broad cost estimate for implementing recommendations Print executive summary text on coloured paper	#	

Part 1 - Base information			
1.1	Introduction, including route and primary destination (s) (see LCDS Fig 6.2), Link description, road names, Link length (available from LCN+ team at LB Camden), controlling authorities for the Link	2	
1.2	Description of CRISP methodology based on the brief	1	
1.3	Strategic context, including A4 size extract from overall LCN+ key map for London . Objectives for the Link and significant barriers, constraints and opportunities	1	
1.4	<p>A3 Z-folded plan showing the following on appropriate scale grey scale street mapping:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link in light blue • alternative routes in dashed light blue • other LCN+ Links in orange with Link number, including Links connecting into other boroughs with Link number and primary destinations indicated • other LCN routes in dashed orange • TLRN outlined red • borough boundaries in black with adjacent boroughs named <p>Street names must not be obscured by the route colouring.</p> <p>Supplementary information to aid understanding of the route context could include a map extract of the London Cycle Guide with the Link to be studied marked on it</p>	#A3	#
1.5	List of CRIM invitees List of Other Stakeholders to whom Questionnaire was issued	#	
Part 2 – Summary of data and information gathered			
IMPORTANT –			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • this is to be a summary of existing data only • all sections to be completed (enter none or n/a as applicable) 			
	Provide a summary , with tables and drawings/diagrams where appropriate, of the following information where it is relevant to the proposed or any alternative Link:		
2.1	Provisional description of Link Sections/Elements summarising their characteristics	1	
2.2	Key trip generators, including relevant rail stations, educational establishments, major employers, retail centres	1	
2.3	Cycle flow data and significant movements joining/leaving and crossing the Link and, if appropriate, adjacent routes	2	

	2.4	Existing conditions for cycling, including cycle specific facilities and problems	1	
	2.5	Cycle accident data, noting casualty hotspots	1	
	2.6	Motor traffic flow data, including modal split, HGV proportions and peak hour bus flows	2	
	2.7	Motor traffic speed data (limits and survey information where available)	1	
	2.8	Link and junction capacity and related issues	1	
	2.9	Pedestrian amenity related issues	1	
	2.10	Precis of and conclusions from historic reports, correspondence and consultations	1	
	2.11	Current and proposed highway or related (e.g. parks) schemes and/or studies which could affect the Link and alternative routes	2	
	2.12	Current and proposed public and private sector developments that will affect the Link and alternative routes (whether by physical works or trip generation)	2	
	2.13	Major services plant that could influence treatment options	1	
	2.14	Enforcement issues relating to motor traffic and cycling	1	
	2.15	<i>Any other miscellaneous information not covered in previous sub-sections</i>	#	
	Part 3 – Questionnaire and responses			
	3.1	Summary narrative of issues arising from questionnaire responses	1	
	3.2	Spreadsheet summarising questionnaire responses (full responses to be included in Appendix B) including matters arising from the questionnaires to be followed up with stakeholders	1A3	
	3.3	Copy of questionnaire with covering letter and plan	#	
	Part 4 – Drawing(s)			
	4.1	Give list of large-size folded drawings appended in plastic pockets at the end of the report. These will be at 1:2500 scale with appropriate background street mapping and borough boundaries, printed in a sufficiently dense shade of grey that street names are clearly legible. Cut lines will be shown to identify the joints between adjacent strips of mapping presented on the same sheet. The drawings will show the following: (Note that for complicated routes it may be necessary to show some of the information on a separate plan or plans)		

	<p>Drawing (s) at end of report</p>	<p>Existing situation on Link and alternative routes Title: "Existing Situation"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ provisional identification of Sections (and Elements if required) ▪ existing characteristics of Sections including general land use, frontage activity, number of lanes/bus lanes, widths, signalised junctions, parking and loading restrictions, speed limits and speed survey data ▪ Trip generators e.g. educational establishments, leisure facilities and public transport stations and interchanges in close proximity to the Link or alternative routes ▪ main motor vehicle, cycle and pedestrian movements including HGV proportion and peak hour bus frequency ▪ cycle specific facilities/infrastructure (e.g. lanes, tracks, ASL's, crossings, cycle only gaps etc) with widths stated where appropriate ▪ existing problems for cyclists including pinchpoints, discontinuities, narrow tracks, unclear facilities, enforcement etc ▪ cyclist casualty locations using standard referencing diagrams ▪ other LCN+ Links in orange wash with Link number, including Links connecting into other boroughs with Link number and primary destinations indicated ▪ cycle routes as shown on current London Cycle Guides in colour coded wash (except for the Link itself or alternative routes) ▪ TLRN outlined red ▪ borough boundaries in black with adjacent boroughs named ▪ any other relevant location specific information (current or proposed) such as town centre schemes, 20mph zones, traffic calming, homezones, private sector developments etc <p>a comprehensive key covering all the above items (with "not applicable" against items that intentionally do not appear on the plan)</p>	<p>A1 or A0</p>
	<p>Drawing (s) at end of report</p>	<p>Title: "Recommendations"</p> <p>Show the recommended route for the LCN+ Link in solid line, highlighting any sections that are different from the LCN+ Link route shown in original brief.</p> <p>Show any alternative route(s) applicable at certain times of day (e.g. when parks are closed) in dashed line.</p> <p>Show spurs connecting to key generators in dotted line.</p>	<p>A1 or A0</p>

		Show the Sections and Elements with boxed descriptions of the recommendations for each using the Section/Element reference.		
	4.xx	If necessary, provide supplementary plans clarifying outline recommendations and other relevant supporting information.	As required	
Part 5 – Consideration and Summary of Strategy Options and Costs				
		This is the key part of the report which must include a data sheet for each Section or Element , a description of the issues, a photograph to give the context, the strategy options and treatments, budget costs, assessment of each option and reasons for rejection or recommendation: Divide the Link(s) into Sections defined by changes in character. Where a number of different treatments are considered necessary within a Section , sub-divide the Section into Elements . Sections should be numbered and Elements should be lettered.		
		Provide a data sheet for each Section/Element containing the following:		
	5.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Location and reference to identify each section/element (e.g. L101-4B for LCN+ Link 101, Section 4, Element B) ▪ Name of highway authority (or other responsible implementing body e.g. park authority etc.) ▪ Date of site inspection ▪ A single photograph with description representing the section/element (additional photographs to be provided on the following sheet (s) as required) ▪ Brief description of existing characteristics including land use, frontage activity, widths, cycle facilities, motor traffic and cycle flows, ▪ Brief description of problems and barriers for cyclists ▪ Summarise issues raised by stakeholders, noting support, concerns and risks ▪ Constraints e.g. narrow bridge, junction capacity ▪ Opportunities e.g. from new development ▪ Description of strategy options and proposals for each section/element with budget scheme costs for each option ▪ Other comments, but only if relevant, positive or recommendation (including any cross border issues) ▪ Recommendations with reasons for choice and why other options not recommended 	1 each (example provided in Annex 4)	

	5.2	<p>Spread sheet summarising the information shown on the individual data sheets with the addition of advantages and disadvantages of each strategy option considered.</p> <p>Include columns in the spreadsheet for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section/Element Reference ▪ Strategy Option reference ▪ Brief description of option ▪ Benefits ▪ Disbenefits ▪ Budget Cost (from Part 6) <p>The recommended options are to be shown in bold or in a separate column and the total costs of the recommended options to be shown at the foot of the table.</p>	A3	
Part 6 - Summary of costs				
	6.1	<p>Spreadsheet showing budget cost estimates of each strategy option, noting if funding available from external sources (e.g. Section 106 funding from developments). See guidance in LCDS 7.13.</p> <p>Breakdown into the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Traffic management, Speed Reduction ▪ Lanes, tracks or paths for cyclists ▪ Junction works, including signals ▪ Crossing provision, including signals ▪ Signing and road markings ▪ Other miscellaneous works ▪ Statutory undertakers works ▪ Fees etc. ▪ Preliminaries (including traffic management during construction) 	A3	
Part 7 - Proposed Programme				
	7.1	<p>A provisional outline programme for implementing each of the report recommendations broken down into feasibility , design, consultation and implementation in financial year.</p> <p>The programme must be agreed with the implementation authorities, i.e. borough (guidance available from LB Camden LCN+ Project Manager) or TfL Area Team.</p>	A4 or A3 as required	

		APPENDICES		
	A	Record of CRIM: Summary of the CRIM, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ List of attendees, organisation and position ▪ Description of significant matters arising, ▪ areas of agreement, ▪ significant constraints identified ▪ distribution list for the note 	#	
	B	Questionnaire responses including dates of completion or receipt	#	
	C	Written responses to the Draft CRISP report.	#	
	D	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 (these could be incorporated in the LCN+ Asset Management Initiative programme)	#	
	X	<i>Any other relevant supporting information, including significant written additional material submitted by consultees or other third parties during the course of the study.</i>	#	

Notes:

1	# = variable, dependent on input
2	Parts 1, 2, 3 and 4.1 and the Existing Situation drawing in the CRISP report are to be Parts 1, 2, 3 and 4.1 and the Existing Situation drawing from the pre-CRIM report, revised as necessary
3	Font for text normally to be Arial 12 point.