





COPECAT

Concise Pedestrian and Cycle Audit



Greater
Manchester
Passenger
Transport
Authority

Contact:

Greater Manchester Joint
Transportation Policy Team
0161 242 6084

mail@gmltp.co.uk

www.gmltp.co.uk

©AGMA 2003

COPECAT

CONCISE CYCLE & PEDESTRIAN AUDIT

BENEFITS OF AUDIT PROCESS

The Greater Manchester Concise Pedestrian & Cycle Audit has been compiled in order to provide a consistent approach to pedestrian and cycle infrastructure across the conurbation, and to encourage its widespread use. Authorities are encouraged to use audit procedures in the Greater Manchester Local Transport Plan Cycling Strategy and the Walking Strategy. However, use of the IHT Cycle Audit Guidelines is sparse, due to the inflexibility of the system, and the lack of staff resources to implement effectively.

An effective pedestrian and cycle audit procedure would help to:

- Improve the quality of highway or route infrastructure schemes for pedestrians and cyclists, leading to an increase in levels of walking and cycling, and a decrease in pedestrian and cycling casualties,
- Improve the value for money of schemes by providing more effective features and reducing the need to change them at a later date,
- Identify and take advantage of opportunities to improve pedestrian and cycling infrastructure thereby maximising outputs in poorly resourced areas,
- Address some of the conflicts between pedestrians, disabled people and cyclists
- Reduce the number of complaints by members of the public and councillors, leading to more satisfied customers and improved staff morale,
- Raise awareness of the needs of these vulnerable groups, and assist local authority staff in improving their skills and knowledge of how to cater for them,
- Reduce officer time in assessing developers' schemes if the proposals have been subject to the audit procedure prior to submission,
- Give an opportunity for local pedestrians and cyclists to have an input into the design procedure,
- Achieve a greater degree of design consistency in county-wide pedestrian and cycle networks.

A FLEXIBLE APPROACH

This system is an attempt to provide a quicker, less demanding audit. It offers greater flexibility in terms of which schemes it applies to, and how it is applied. It is considered that this will appeal to all Greater Manchester authorities, increase the use of audit procedures, and result in better quality and more effective schemes. The guidance is not supposed to be proscriptive; it is more about ensuring that the needs of pedestrians, disabled people and cyclists have been considered in the scheme's design. The final engineering solution will often entail a compromise as a result of having to accommodate different user groups' needs. In time it may be possible to create design standards for all road users; in the meantime this audit should help ensure that opportunities are taken to create high quality infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists.

1 CONCISE AUDIT TOOLKIT CONTENTS

The toolkit contains the following:

- Quick reference cards asking key questions, and referring to the relevant guidance.
- Audit forms, based on the same format as the reference cards, requiring completion by engineer or audit team
- At-A-Glance Quick Reference Guidance
- Suggested scheme record card

2 EXTENT OF AUDIT

Each Authority has a different level of staff resources to devote to pedestrian and cycle audits, and these may change over time as staff numbers and expertise change. The LTP Cycle and Walking Groups would encourage as much use of the audit system as possible, consistent with the resources available. Authorities should select the most appropriate audit type based on the nature of the scheme in question, and the resources available to them. This flexible process is illustrated in Table One. Each process is then described in more detail. The stages of audit are taken to be similar to that of the safety audit process; feasibility, preliminary design, detailed design and pre-opening. If the scheme is subject to a pedestrian & cycle audit as well as a safety audit, it is recommended that the pedestrian & cycle audit procedure is carried out before the safety audit.

The time taken for each type of process will vary depending on the size of scheme, the number of audit stages, and the issues raised. It is estimated that time will vary between a matter of minutes for an officer to refer to the checklist, to half a day for each stage if independent auditors are used.

The audit type selection process refers to Authorities' route networks. These include both strategic and local cycle routes, and key pedestrian routes. Both existing and proposed routes should be considered.

Table 1. Audit type selection process.

Staff Resources	Scheme Type	Audit Process Range of Options
Available engineer / planner, independent auditor and preferably local cyclists' / pedestrians' representatives	Cycle or pedestrian specific scheme on route network	Level 5: Completion of concise audit forms by engineer / planner and audit team, at feasibility, preliminary design, detailed design and pre-opening stages.
Engineer / planner and cycle / walking officer	Non-cycle or non-pedestrian specific scheme on route network	Level 4: Completion of concise audit forms by engineer with audit team at most appropriate stages only.
	Cycle or pedestrian specific scheme off route network	Level 3: Completion of concise audit forms by engineer only, at all stages Level 2: Completion of concise audit forms by engineer / planner only, at most appropriate stages only.
Engineer / planner only	Minor non-cycle or non-pedestrian specific scheme off route network	Level 1: Reference to checklist by engineer / planner only

3 APPLICATION OF AUDIT

3.1 Record keeping

It is important that the reasons for the decision on the level of audit used, and decisions arising from its application are recorded. If possible, these procedures should be incorporated into the Quality Assurance procedure of each Authority, to ensure the correct approach is taken. A suggested scheme record card for this purpose is included in the audit toolkit.

3.2 Reference to checklist

Each audit card can be used as a simple checklist by the relevant officer, to assist in the design process. No recording of decision would be necessary; the list would merely function as an aide-memoir. It is recommended that the card is consulted at all four stages in the design and implementation process.

3.3 Completion of audit forms by scheme engineer / planner

The set of audit forms can be copied and used by the scheme engineer / planner as a record of that stage in the design process, and to demonstrate that the issues were considered. The engineer could use these at whichever stages were considered the most appropriate.

3.4 Completion of audit forms by an audit team

In addition to the scheme engineer / planner, the audit team may include the following:

- An independent officer, e.g. a cycle or walking officer or fellow engineer who has not been involved with the scheme. The officer should preferably be a cyclist, and may be from another Council.
- In addition, the Authority may wish to involve a representative of the local cycle, pedestrian or disabled community, such as someone from the local cycle forum. Preferably the representative should have an engineering background, be familiar with the local situation, and be easily available to participate in the process during normal office hours.

The engineer / planner can either complete the audit forms alone, and then have these reviewed by the audit team separately, or the engineer could meet with the audit team to discuss the scheme. This latter option could potentially save officer time.

3.6 Arbitration

Where an independent auditor is used, a member of staff, usually the officer's line manager, should be nominated to arbitrate in the event of a disagreement between engineer and auditors.

3.7 Compliance

Authorities should nominate a compliance officer, possibly the cycle officer or equivalent, who may demand, retrospectively, to see a number of completed forms for various schemes in order to ensure the procedure is being carried out effectively. The officer should be effectively supported in this task by management.

The audit has been produced with the input of external groups representing pedestrians, cyclists and disabled people. These groups may comment on finished schemes in this context.

3.8 Consultation

The audit is not a substitute for effective consultation with local users. It is recommended that staff consider the following according to the nature of each scheme:

- who to consult (pedestrian, disabled or cycling representatives),
- the most appropriate technique to use (e.g. informal conversation, formal letter, Cycle Forum),
- at what stage this is carried out (e.g. design and post-implementation)

3.9 Common Guidance

A number of publications give guidance which is relevant to all sections of this audit. These are:

- *Cycle-Friendly Infrastructure –Guidelines for Planning and Design*. IHT/CTC/DoT 1996
- *Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions*, DfT, 2003
- *Inclusive Mobility: A Guide to Best Practice on Access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure*, DfT (2002)

COPECAT

CONCISE CYCLE & PEDESTRIAN AUDIT

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

* See also At-A-Glance Guidance

ISSUE	COMMENTS	GUIDANCE
Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explore the opportunity for developer contributions to the provision of cycling and pedestrian facilities* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PPG13, circular 11/95
Networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the proposal been assessed using the Road User Hierarchy* ? Does the development need to cater for strategic or local cycle and pedestrian networks through the site? Are all roads safe for cyclists and pedestrians to use and cross, or are separate facilities, traffic calming or crossings required? Does the nature and scale of the development require a specific internal pedestrian and cycle route network, as well as connections to the local network? If so, is this included? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GMLTP Walking Strategy GMLTP Cycle Strategy
Routes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the route: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connected? – easy to get from place to place without meeting dead ends or difficult road crossings Convenient? – direct routes without unnecessary detours; shops, services and homes as close together as possible Comfortable? – well maintained and designed, wide enough, well lit, offering shelter and resting places and information Convivial?–friendly, attractive and interesting Safe? – both in terms of road safety and personal security 	
Cycle Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has sufficient cycle parking* been incorporated? Is there a differentiation between long stay for staff, short stay for customers/visitors, residents facilities* ? Does installation comply with spacing specifications and security issues* ? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GM Cycle Parking Guidelines
Signals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can approach lanes and Advanced Stop Lines* be provided at traffic signals? Have cycle detection loops been installed? Can bypass lanes be provided for any cycle movements? What is the most appropriate type of signalised crossing for the situation and user groups involved? Are full pedestrian facilities to be provided on all arms of traffic signal controlled junctions? Have audible and / or tactile signals been installed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LTN 1/98: The Installation of Traffic Signals and Associated Equipment TAL 8/93 Advanced stop lines Guidance on the use of tactile paving surfaces, DTLR 1999 The Design of Pedestrian Crossings, LTN 2/95, TSO 1995 Audible and Tactile Signals at Pelican Crossings, TAL 4/91, DTLR 1991 Audible and Tactile Signals at Signal Controlled Junctions, TAL 5/91, DTLR 1991 Puffin Pedestrian Crossings, TAL 1/01 Installation of Puffin Pedestrian Crossings, TAL 1/02
Garage size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can garage accommodate cycles and car(s)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6m x 2.6m or similar
Road Closure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can pedestrian and cycle access be provided safely? 	
Signs, lighting and street furniture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are signs mounted at 2.4m for cyclists, 2.1m for pedestrians? Are destinations signed for pedestrians and cyclists? Is all street furniture necessary? Is street furniture consistent in style and colour? Is all signing, lighting columns and street furniture, including bus stops, arranged to minimise clutter, and outside the path? Is lighting adequate for visually impaired people? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LTN 2/87 Signs for Cycle Facilities

COPECAT

CONCISE CYCLE & PEDESTRIAN AUDIT

ROUTE PLANNING

* See also At-A-Glance Guidance

ISSUE	COMMENTS	GUIDANCE
Route location	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the route: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Connected? – easy to get from place to place without meeting dead ends or difficult road crossings – Convenient? – direct routes without unnecessary detours; shops, services and homes as close together as possible – Comfortable? – well maintained and designed, wide enough, well lit, offering shelter and resting places and information. Does it avoid busy traffic, substantive areas of on-road parking and steep gradients*, within reason? – Convivial?–friendly, attractive and interesting – Safe? – both in terms of road safety and personal security • Can / does the route coincide with any school or workplace travel plan initiatives? • Can / does the route coincide with any safer routes initiatives, e.g. to schools or stations • If the route intersects with other routes, have all movements been catered for? 	
Selection of techniques to cater for cyclists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can traffic flows / speeds be reduced, or the numbers of heavier vehicles reduced? • Can on-road cycle lanes be implemented? • Can an off-road route be provided? 	Cycle-Friendly Infrastructure

PUBLIC TRANSPORT SCHEMES

ISSUE	COMMENTS	GUIDANCE
Stop location and design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is stop in a safe, secure and convenient location? • Is stop fully accessible for all pedestrians, wheelchair users and cyclists if appropriate? • Has a shelter been provided which allows good visibility of approaching vehicles and is acceptable in highway safety terms? • Has sufficient footway width been provided to accommodate waiting passengers and passers-by? • Have GMPTE been consulted? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GMPTE guidance on public transport and development (emerging)
Interchanges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do safe, secure and convenient access routes for pedestrians, wheelchair users and cyclists exist, and are they clearly marked? • Has secure and convenient long and short stay cycle parking* been provided? • Are operators aware of cycle parking procedures*? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GMPTE Interchanges Strategy • GM Cycle Parking Guidelines
Metrolink	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do pedestrian and cycle routes cross tracks at 90 degrees where possible? • Is rail height is flush or thereabouts with carriageway? • Are pedestrian tactile warning surfaces in place? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metrolink Local Authorities' Design Guide
Cycle carriage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has provision been made for cycle carriage, where appropriate? 	

See also Bus Lane and Bus layby in Highway Schemes section

COPECAT

CONCISE CYCLE & PEDESTRIAN AUDIT

STRUCTURES SCHEMES

* See also At-A-Glance Guidance

ISSUE	COMMENTS	GUIDANCE
Bridges / steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has sufficient width* been provided to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists? Can a wheeling ramp or channel be provided? Is the gradient appropriate, are risers of consistent height and have handrails been provided*? Is the parapet height* appropriate for the intended users? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 6, TD 36/93 Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 2, BD 52/93
Subways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can the subway be replaced with a surface crossing or bridge? Are widths* adequate? Can lighting and visibility be improved? Are the approaches suitable for cyclists and disabled people, with appropriate gradients, ramps, steps and handrails*? Are cyclists and pedestrians segregated? Does adjacent vegetation require removal? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 6, TD36/93

MAINTENANCE SCHEMES

* See also At-A-Glance Guidance

ISSUE	COMMENTS	GUIDANCE
Street works	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do road works* cater for pedestrians and cyclists? Are pavement works guarded by appropriate barriers*? Are temporary lanes of suitable width for cyclists and general traffic ? (below 3m or over 4m preferred) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TAL 15/99 Cyclists at roadworks
Resurfacing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can crossing facilities be provided on reinstatement? Can footways and other pedestrian facilities be improved on reinstatement? Can cycle lanes, advanced stop lines and other facilities be provided on reinstatement? May surfacing treatments risk cyclists' safety, cause discomfort? Do they meet DMRB skid resistance standards? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 7, HD 36/99
Patching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has increased consideration been given to haunches and defects within 2m of carriageway edge? Have reinstatements been carried out satisfactorily? 	
Drainage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are gullies located away from crossing points? Are gullies cycle friendly? Consider use of beany blocks or replacement gully covers if existing gully covers use parallel bars Are gullies flush with surface? 	
Lining	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can cycle lanes, advanced stop lines and other facilities be provided on reinstatement? 	
Vegetation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are only thornless shrubs used adjacent to cycle route? Does overhanging vegetation require removal? 	
Street cleansing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can sweeping regime be improved for pedestrian and cycle routes? Are cycle facilities, particularly bypasses, swept frequently enough? Are litter bins regularly emptied? Is graffiti and fly posting dealt with promptly? Are measures to reduce dog fouling necessary? 	

COPECAT

CONCISE CYCLE & PEDESTRIAN AUDIT

HIGHWAYS SCHEMES

* See also At-A-Glance Guidance

FACILITY	COMMENTS	GUIDANCE
New Signal Junction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can cyclists and pedestrians make all movements easily? • Have approach lanes and Advanced Stop Lines* (ASLs) been provided? • Can bypass lanes be provided for any movements? • Can cyclists turn right easily? • If left turn filters are used, can a lane be provided to help cyclists to go straight on? • Have cycle detection loops been installed? • Can timings be arranged to benefit vulnerable road users? • Have audible and / or tactile signals been installed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LTN 1/98: The Installation of Traffic Signals and Associated Equipment • TAL 8/93 Advanced stop lines • TAL 5/96 Further development of ASLs
T-junction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have wide junction mouths been avoided where possible? • Have pedestrian crossing facilities been provided? • Have advisory cycle lanes been extended across junction mouths? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LTN 1/86 Cyclists at Road Crossings and junctions
Roundabouts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can another form of junction control, e.g. signals, be used? • Can vehicle speeds be further reduced? • Can a single lane circulatory system* be used? • If not, has a peripheral cycle path been provided at large roundabouts? • Have pedestrian crossing facilities been provided? • Do facilities for pedestrians and cyclists minimise delay? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TAL 9/97 Cycling at roundabouts
New Zebra or controlled crossing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has puffin crossing been considered rather than a zebra, for pedestrian only routes? • Has a toucan crossing been installed if crossing point is on strategic or local cycle network? • Have tactile paving / facilities been installed? • Does crossing conform to latest guidance? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TAL 10/93 Toucan crossings • TAL 4/98 Toucan crossing development • LTN 1/95 Assessment of pedestrian crossings • LTN 2/95 Design of Pedestrian Crossings • TAL 5/95 Guidance on Use of Tactile Paving Surfaces
New refuge / island	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is refuge depth at least 2m (to allow cyclists to wait on refuge) and crossing width 3m or 4m (to allow cyclists/pedestrians to pass) if on the cycle network? • If insufficient room for refuge, can a controlled crossing be implemented instead? • Has a high quality cycle bypass been provided if refuge / island creates a pinch point, especially on a high speed road (40mph or above)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TAL 1/97 Cyclists at road narrowings
Cycle Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If multiple traffic lanes exist, can one be removed to create room for cyclists? • Is lane width* 2m (or a minimum of 1.5m) for a long length? Local narrowing below 1.2m is acceptable to ensure continuity of cycle lane. • Is there sufficient space next to parking/loading areas* ? • Are mandatory lanes or no-waiting TRO necessary if parking problems exist? • Can advisory lanes be extended through pinch points? • Is green coloured surfacing necessary where conflict is likely to occur? 	
Inside/Nearside Lane Width	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For carriageways where there is insufficient space for a cycle lane, can the nearside lane be at least 4.25m width? 	
One-Way Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would a contra-flow cycle lane* be appropriate, especially if the road is part of the cycle network? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TAL 6/98 Contraflow cycle lanes

Pedestrian / Shared use cycle paths adjacent to carriageway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has on-road provision, with traffic volume and speed reductions, been considered? • Has the route been given priority over driveways and accesses, and can it be given priority at side roads* ? • Has parking on the path been prevented or discouraged? • Has at least 1.5m width provided for pedestrians, and 2.0m for cyclists been provided, if segregated* ? • Is the crossfall between 1 and 2%? • Has correct signing and lining been provided* ? • Are tactile markings required? • Is 'cycle calming' necessary to reduce danger at possible points of conflict? • Can cyclists join main carriageway at 90 degrees? • Have cycle, pedestrian and disabled groups been consulted? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LTN 2/87 Signs for Cycle Facilities • TAL 4/90 tactile markings for segregated shared use • TAL 5/95 Guidance on Use of Tactile Paving Surfaces
Off-highway routes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has status of cycle path been determined as adopted highway, bridleway, cycle track or concessionary? • Has adequate width* been provided if shared use? • Has the path got a suitable alignment* ? • Have drainage problems been addressed? • Is surfacing all-weather, easy to maintain, comfortable, skid-resistant, appropriate to the path's status and sympathetic to the surroundings? • Have signing, lining and tactile markings been provided? • Can the route be given priority over minor roads* ? • Is lighting required, especially if a commuter route? • Can cyclists join main carriageway at 90 degrees? • Have cycle, pedestrian and disabled groups been consulted? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See attached guidance summary re. widths • LTN 2/87 Signs for Cycle Facilities • TAL 4/90 tactile markings for segregated shared use • TAL 5/95 Guidance on Use of Tactile Paving Surfaces
Traffic Calming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have vertical deflections* for cyclists been avoided (whilst maintaining effect on cars), or cycle friendly deflections such as sinusoidal humps* used (special authorisation may be required)? • Has a 1m gap (0.75m min) been left in between traffic calming features and the edge of the carriageway? • Have high quality bypasses* been provided at pinch points? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TAL 1/87 measures to control traffic for the benefit of residents, pedestrians and cyclists • TAL 1/97 Cyclists at road narrowings • TAL 2/95 Raised rib mark • TAL 4/94 Speed cushions • TAL 9/98 Sinusoidal, H and S humps
Road Closure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can safe pedestrian and cycle access be maintained*, both physically and in TROs? 	
Drop kerb	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is kerb flush, and has tactile paving been provided for pedestrians if on a pedestrian route? 	
Bus Lay-by	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is upstand flush between carriageway and lay-by? 	
Bus Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the lane width 4.25-4.6m to allow buses and cyclists to overtake each other? 	
Drainage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are any conventional gullies located at pinch point or pedestrian crossing point? Alternative gully design or location may be required. • Do gully grate bars run perpendicular to kerb? 	
Signs, lighting and street furniture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are signs mounted at 2.4m for cyclists, 2.1m for pedestrians? • Is all street furniture necessary? • Is street furniture consistent in style and colour? • Is all signing, lighting columns and street furniture, including bus stops, arranged to minimise clutter, and outside the path where possible? • Are destinations signed for pedestrians and cyclists? • Is lighting adequate for visually impaired people? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LTN 2/87 Signs for Cycle Facilities
Cycle Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does installation comply with spacing specifications and security issues? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G M Cycle parking Guidelines

Additional guidance:

Cycle-Friendly Infrastructure – Guidelines for Planning and Design. IHT / BA / CTC / DoT (1996)

Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions, DfT, 2003

Inclusive Mobility: A Guide to Best Practice on Access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure, DfT (2002)

SUGGESTED SCHEME RECORD CARD

SCHEME:.....

DISTRICT:.....

ENGINEER:.....

Level of audit chosen:

One Two Three Four Five

Reasons for choice:

Scheme type:

.....

.....

Staff resources:

.....

.....

For level 2 audits and above

Members of audit team:.....

.....

.....

Improvements made as a result of audit:

• Ensure LTP-F4 outputs have been recorded for scheme, in particular

RC1	Number of toucan or puffin crossings	<input type="text"/>	
RC2	Number of signalised crossings	<input type="text"/>	
RC3	Number of other unsignalised crossings	<input type="text"/>	
RC4	Number of underpass replacements	<input type="text"/>	
WA1	Number of new / improved footways	<input type="text"/>	
WA2	Length of new / improved footways	<input type="text"/>	m
WA3	Number of new pedestrianisation schemes	<input type="text"/>	
WA4	Length of new pedestrianisation schemes	<input type="text"/>	m
WA5	Number of new / improved pedestrian / cycle bridges	<input type="text"/>	
WA6	Number of other walking schemes	<input type="text"/>	
CY1	Number of new / improved off-road cycle routes	<input type="text"/>	
CY2	Length of new / improved off-road cycle routes	<input type="text"/>	km
CY3	Number of new / lengthened on-road cycle lanes	<input type="text"/>	
CY4	Length of new / lengthened on-road cycle lanes	<input type="text"/>	km
CY5	Number of individual new advanced stop lines	<input type="text"/>	
CY6	Number of locations with new / improved cycle parking schemes	<input type="text"/>	
CY7	Number of other cycle infrastructure schemes	<input type="text"/>	
OS1	Number of other cycle schemes	<input type="text"/>	

• Attach completed audit sheets