APPENDIX F

Network Cost Estimates

Local cycling and walking infrastructure plan

Isle of Wight (Newport and Ryde) 2020-2030

Cost Estimates for Cycling Interventions

In developing the cost estimates for each route the following assumptions have been made:

Recommendations are based on a high-level audit of streets rather than detailed surveys. Recommendations have only been included where they appear to be deliverable but there may be issues beyond the scope of the audit which would restrict deliverability.

Recommendations are relatively general, more specific scheme details will require more detailed survey and design work.

1. In many situations there are multiple options for delivery, and the specific recommendations are based on the professional opinion of the audit team based on the information available to them and primarily considering benefit for people walking and cycling, rather than issues like impact on traffic flow.

2. In all assessments maintenance issues (including poor surface quality) that will be attended to during the core improvement period of the highways PFI have been ignored for scoring purposes and recommendations for remedial action.

3. Traffic flows and speeds are estimated except where survey data was provided.

4. All new/improved routes for walking or cycling are assumed to be provided with a bituminous surface or similar to provide a smooth, comfortable surface for walking/cycling. Cycle tracks and shared use paths are assumed to be machine-laid.

5. It is assumed that all schemes will be designed to a high standard, using modern design principles that provide high-quality walking and cycling environments. This is likely to require a change in approach from recently delivered walking and cycling infrastructure projects on the Isle of Wight.

6. All cycle routes will require signage. This is not explicitly addressed within individual schemes but would need to be of a high quality and employ a consistent approach across the network.

7. Some schemes for walking and cycling may not be compatible with one another. Where possible we have sought to ensure compatibility but, in some situations, the ideal walking and cycling schemes require the same space. If both walking and cycling schemes were to be advanced in these locations, it may be necessary to identify an alternative approach which addresses both but with some compromises.

8. In a few situations combined projects for walking and cycling have been identified and these are appropriately cross referenced between the walking and cycling schedules. Generally stand-alone walking and cycling schemes have been shown.

9. 2m has been used as the minimum desirable width for new footways, but where widths are already 1.8m (a previously applied standard) it is anticipated footways would not be widened to 2m unless wider changes are required.

10. 3m as the minimum desirable width for new cycleways, but where widths are already 2.5m it is anticipated routes would not normally be widened, though as the network develops and demand grows this may become necessary in some cases.

11. All section lengths specified are approximate.

12. Some sub-standard sections (particularly in terms of width) may be necessary on pragmatic grounds but this should always be seen as a last resort to complete a section of route.

13. When assessing scores for the cycling Route Selection Tool post-improvement scores assume all parts of the proposed network have been completed.

14. Estimated volumes of users are based on very limited data availability and should be treated with extreme caution.

15. Where two routes share a junction, recommendations for that junction are only listed under one route

Cost Estimates for Walking Interventions

Cost estimates for the above proposed walking routes are shown in Appendix C and D.

In developing the cost estimated the following assumptions have been assumed:

1. In general, there is a need for better visual identification of cycle tracks through use of coloured surfacing, road markings etc. rather than large amounts of additional signage. Routes should be legible and easily identifiable. Dutch practice gives good examples of this, where cycle track designs are obvious (usually surfaced in red tarmac and distinctly marked) and signage plays a secondary role.

2. It is anticipated that as part of all schemes that street furniture would be assessed and rationalised, with consolidation of street furniture, removal of unnecessary items and relocation of items which cause an impediment to pedestrians.

3. It is anticipated that as part of all schemes any incorrect tactile paving will be re-laid correctly and any poorly dropped kerbs will be replaced with fully flush kerbs.

4. In many locations on-street parking is located too close to junctions and crossings, impeding visibility. Some of the worst cases have been identified within specific schemes but as a general principle greater distances between crossings and legal parking should be improved.

5. While the focus of the commission as on walking and cycling routes, it is also important to consider the importance of creating low-traffic neighbourhoods. Here an area wide treatment needs to be used, possibly alongside route-based treatments along main roads bordering the neighbourhood or "cell". This approach can humanise local neighbourhoods but also provide key connectivity to, from and between main routes.

6. Wider traffic management is needed in some areas; this is beyond the scope of this commission, which only highlights some relatively minor traffic management issues with limited knock-on effects. However, the ability to change traffic flows, introduce restrictions on HGVs in some areas and manage parking controls more holistically would unblock further improvements.

7. Controlled crossing where observed to be almost universally provided to the minimum width, many would be improved by providing wider crossings. 2.4m shouldn't be seen as a standard, but as a minimum. Specific cases where a large improvement would be made by widening crossings are highlighted in individual schemes but there are few cases where wider crossings would not bring benefit to pedestrians.

8. There is a need for clear quality and designs standards to create a high-quality environment for walking and cycling. These standards should be applied across all street improvement schemes. Examples include keeping footways level rather than allowing vehicle crossovers and similar to continually disrupt levels, parking meters should not be located on footways, street furniture should generally be located to the rear of the footway, and signage attached to buildings where possible and street furniture, signage etc should be consolidated. Quality standards should also be embedded in the planning systems to ensure new developments meet the highest standards, possibly through creation of Supplementary Planning Guidance on Active Travel infrastructure provision.