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1. **Forward**

1.1 The Government has invited local transport authorities to publish LCWIPs to help deliver their Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy and Staffordshire County Council has risen to the challenge to help Government achieve, by 2040, its ambition to deliver:

- **Better Safety** - A safe and reliable way to travel for short journeys

- **Better Mobility** - More people cycling and walking – easy, normal and enjoyable

- **Better Streets** - Places that have cycling and walking at their heart

1.2 This is Staffordshire County Council’s first Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and the vision is to:

‘Increase people’s connectivity through cycling and walking to employment, education and leisure, leading to positive changes in modal shift, enabling people to lead safer, healthier and more independent lives’.

1.3 The LCWIP will build on the Council’s successful delivery of previous sustainable transport projects. It takes a comprehensive network approach and targets the areas where there is the greatest demand and the largest potential for the transfer of short journeys to walking or cycling.

1.4 It is particularly important in these challenging times that the County Council maximises the benefits of its investment, whilst generating the best outcomes for the residents of Staffordshire.
2. Executive Summary

Introduction

2.1 The Government’s Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy (CWIS) aims to double cycling levels by 2025, increase walking activity, reduce the rate of cyclists killed or seriously injured (KSI), and increase the percentage of school children walking to school.

2.2 In support of the CWIS, Department for Transport (DfT) has been encouraging local authorities to prepare a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) in order to take a more strategic approach to planning walking and cycling. The County Council considers that the LCWIP will provide many benefits, most importantly the provision of a route based, robust and objective led method for prioritising investment in cycling and walking in the short, medium and long term. This will be pivotal in helping the County Council to continue to make the case for future walking and cycling funding.

2.3 Staffordshire’s draft LCWIP has been approved by the County Council’s Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport. It identifies where we should be targeting our investment in infrastructure within the compact urban areas of Burton upon Trent, Cannock, Lichfield, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Stafford and Tamworth, which are of a size that can support journey distances that can be made by walking and cycling.

2.4 LCWIPs are supported by National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) which states that planning policies should provide for high quality walking and cycling networks and supporting facilities such as cycle parking (drawing on Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans).

Methodology

2.5 Staffordshire County Council received 60 days of technical support from Phil Jones Associates (PJA), managed by Associate Director, Adrian Lord, which has resulted in recommendations that are evidenced by GIS analysis that has determined where the highest demand for cycling is. Both PJA and Sustrans provided a high level of experience in the auditing of the priority cycling routes and town centre walking zones to help identify schemes that are expected to be effective and deliverable.

2.6 The network planning for cycling relied on the mapping of the main origin and destination points across the six urban areas. Commuter and school trips were considered, together with forecast future demand from proposed new residential development sites. This analysis identified the links on the network that are expected to attract the most cyclists and it is on these links where proposed schemes have been identified. A combined total of 144km of cycle network has been identified throughout the six urban areas, so further prioritisation was essential to determine which schemes should be identified for short, medium or long term spend.
2.7 GIS analysis provided an indication of the most likely walking routes to employment. As expected, the volume of pedestrians on these routes was not significantly high in comparison to the levels of pedestrian activity within town centres. It was therefore concluded that the town centres should be defined as the core walking zones where the greatest number of walking trip generators are located close together and where all pedestrian infrastructure is deemed to be important. All routes within the town centres where both pedestrians and vehicles are accommodated were audited.

2.8 The analysis identified a total of 200 potential schemes throughout the six urban centres that could benefit cyclists and/or pedestrians ranging from an estimated cost of £10,000 to £1.5m, with a combined total cost of around £31m. These schemes have been prioritised in terms of:

- **Effectiveness of Scheme**
  - Cycle to work demand
  - Cycle / walk to school demand
  - Forecast future cycle demand
  - Town centre location with high pedestrian demand

- **Fit with Policy**
  - Connects to rail
  - Proximity to new jobs and schools
  - Improves safety
  - Improves cycle network density
  - Enhances walking zone

- **Economic Impact**
  - Indicative value for money

- **Deliverability**
  - Scheme feasibility
  - Potential to attract funding

**Results**

2.9 Burton upon Trent has the greatest length of cycle links, at 43km, that could potentially attract significant numbers of cycle journeys, with a large proportion being on relatively quiet residential streets. Lichfield has the lowest length at 11km, although all routes in Lichfield are a medium to high priority if deliverable solutions can be identified. Newcastle-under-Lyme’s priority cycle network may be the most challenging to improve as large sections are on heavily trafficked A roads. In contrast, the network identified in Cannock focuses on residential roads. Generally, it is considered that Stafford and Tamworth have the most extensive existing cycle networks.

2.10 The greatest potential for improved cycle provision is where footways on the highway and traffic-free paths are wide enough for conversion to shared use; road widths are wide enough and traffic flows low enough to easily re-allocate road space to cyclists; and where there are quiet residential streets with little
on-street parking and low traffic speeds. Realistically, large lengths of footway are too narrow to accommodate cyclists; residential streets are often dominated by parked cars; and main roads into town centres are busy and narrow.

2.11 Nevertheless, the audit has confirmed that schemes can be identified in many locations by combining a mixture of solutions along priority routes, without significantly deviating from cycle desire lines. It is also clear from the audit results that large sections of the existing cycle network have been poorly maintained due to very limited maintenance resources being ring-fenced for investment in footways and cycleways.

2.12 The walking audit of town centre routes (excluding pedestrian priority areas) has revealed that Stafford has the highest performing walking zone and Newcastle-under-Lyme is the lowest performing. Newcastle’s low score is attributed to the inclusion of the ring road. Cannock generally has a good level of provision but suffers from poor footway maintenance. Concerns in Burton upon Trent are often more related to pedestrian / vehicle conflict. Footway maintenance and pedestrian crossing provision is highlighted as concerns in Lichfield, and there are narrow footways on numerous routes in Tamworth that provide vehicle access to car parks. It is considered that most walking issues highlighted across the six town centres are relatively easy to resolve, if funding was made available.

Recommendations

2.13 It is considered that in order for Staffordshire County Council to have the ability to help the government achieve its ambition of Better Safety, Better Mobility and Better Streets, around £31m of investment is required up to 2030/31 on the priority cycle networks and core walking zones in Burton upon Trent, Cannock, Lichfield, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Stafford and Tamworth. As required by LCWIP guidance, the 200 schemes have been allocated for short, medium or long-term delivery during the period up to 2030/31, as identified in Appendix E. The programme will be subject to ongoing review, following the outcome of consultations, detailed design and the announcement of funding streams.

2.14 £1.164m has been committed by the County Council through funding awards, S106 and IT block to start work on walking and cycling schemes in Stafford, Burton upon Trent and Tamworth. These schemes are listed in Table 8.4. Additional schemes to improve the town centre walking zones totalling around £2.07m have been prioritised for delivery in the short term up to 2023/24 and are listed in Table 8.5. Additional schemes to improve the priority cycle networks totalling around £3.17m have also been prioritised for delivery in the short term up to 2023/24 and are listed in Table 8.6.

Way Forward

2.15 The final version of the LCWIP will be amended as appropriate to include the outcome of further consultations with local communities and key stakeholders.
2.16 The LCWIP recommendations are expected to become embedded in Staffordshire County Council’s Integrated Transport Strategies and into policies and proposals within Local Plans. Through the planning consent process, developers will be made aware of the LCWIP and will be required to consider it in the preparation of Transport Assessments and Travel Plans. The County Council will work with the District/ Borough Councils to encourage vibrant town centres and LCWIP recommendations will be recognised in bids for Future High Street Funds for Stafford, Newcastle-under-Lyme and Tamworth and Town Deal funding for Burton upon Trent and Newcastle-under-Lyme.

2.17 The provision of complementary revenue resources would enable the County Council to promote and encourage use of new walking and cycling facilities. As schemes within the LCWIP programme are delivered, targeted events and activities would help to achieve increased sustainable travel within the six urban centres.
3. Introduction

Background

3.1 The LCWIP concept was introduced in the Government’s Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy (CWIS) in 2017. The CWIS has at its heart three core objectives: better mobility, better streets and better safety. The County Council recognises the importance of these key objectives and they are already intrinsically embedded within the Council’s existing plans and policies.

3.2 Staffordshire’s LCWIP will build upon the integrated approach the County Council already takes to identify transport solutions that help to deliver the County Council’s Strategic Plan, Integrated Transport Strategies and Local Plans, as well as helping to support the delivery of the strategies of Stoke-on-Trent and Staffordshire Local Enterprise Partnership, Midlands Engine, Midlands Connect and the Constellation Partnership.

3.3 The LCWIP will help to identify walking and cycling infrastructure linking jobs and communities together and increasing accessibility in a sustainable manner that encourages modal shift, improves air quality and reduces delays on the road network.

Scope

3.4 Staffordshire is a diverse county and has the largest population of the shire counties in the West Midlands. It is largely rural in nature (80%) however only a quarter of the population live in rural areas. There is no single dominant town acting as the county’s focal point. Instead, the county has large self-contained settlements, market towns, villages and small dispersed settlements. Staffordshire shares its borders with 11 other authorities including Stoke-on-Trent.

3.5 Staffordshire’s LCWIP has a clear focus on its six main urban areas. These comprise compact settlements of a size that can support journey distances that can be easily made by walking and cycling. The LCWIP encourages more people to walk and cycle and become more physically active thereby improving the health and wellbeing of Staffordshire’s residents.

3.6 Hansen scores for accessibility to jobs by walking and cycling have been calculated for the six major urban areas and these show that residents in these areas have access to a large number of jobs by bicycle and that residential areas around the town centres and industrial/business parks can walk to employment within reasonable travel times. The data also demonstrates the potential for more employees to walk and cycle.

3.7 Figure 3.1 shows the dispersed locations of the six urban areas throughout the county that are the focus of this LCWIP and for future LCWIP investment.
Local Context

3.8 Staffordshire is an area of strong growth both in terms of economic and housing development with a population in the six urban areas that ranges between 76,527 and 134,200 based on 2017 estimates. Social and community demographics for each of the urban areas show that levels of obesity and excess weight together with the prevalence of depression are increasing in both adults and children. Providing opportunities to enable more people to walk and cycle and become more physically active will help to reduce the impact of this growth on the environment whilst improving the health and wellbeing of Staffordshire’s residents.

3.9 Table 3.1 demonstrates the opportunities for achieving significant levels of modal shift. The Districts of East Staffordshire and Stafford currently have the highest levels of walking and cycling

Table 3.1: DC7701EWla - Method of travel to work by distance travelled
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Boundaries</th>
<th>% Home Workers</th>
<th>% Cycle</th>
<th>% Walk</th>
<th>% Drive (less than 5km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Cannock Chase</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B East Staffordshire</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Lichfield</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Newcastle-under-Lyme</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E South Staffordshire</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Stafford</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Staffordshire Moorlands</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Tamworth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each figure is a percentage of all people travelling to work by any mode, for all distances

3.10 The distinct characteristics of each of the six urban areas outlined in Figures 3.2 to 3.7 have helped to define the priority walking and cycle routes proposed for investment.
**Burton upon Trent**

3.11 Burton upon Trent is an important employment hub that boasts major employers and a growing distribution/warehousing sector. Growth potential in the area is good with proposals for 20 hectares of employment and 6,500 new dwellings, much of which is permitted and already under construction.

3.12 Census data indicates a relatively high proportion of short journey to work trips in Burton upon Trent, with walking and cycling levels above the national average. There is a high proportion of commuter trips by car from surrounding towns and villages and congestion has contributed to the declaration of two Air Quality Management Areas.

3.13 Investment in the cycle and walking network over recent years has focused on delivering the National Cycle Network (NCN63) which provides an important route through the town. Going forward, investment in the walking and cycling network will support regeneration proposals for the town centre that are expected to be delivered through Town Deal funding, including improved access to the rail station.

**Cannock**

3.14 Cannock is on the northern edge of the West Midlands conurbation and is well served by the M6, the M6 Toll and the Chase Line which provides good rail connections to Birmingham and beyond. The walking and cycling network has seen some recent improvements, however, investment has focused on public transport, particularly in terms of enhancing connectivity to the West Midlands where job opportunities are relatively high. Cannock is identified as the most inactive area compared to the other urban areas, with levels below the England average.

3.15 It is proposed that walking and cycling investment focuses on improving access around Cannock town centre and to surrounding businesses and developments. Enhanced sustainable transport links will be essential to the McArthurGlen Designer Outlet West Midlands development which is expected to attract 3.5 million visitors per annum and to the rail station to improve access to jobs.
Figure 3.2: Burton upon Trent Urban Area
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Lichfield

3.16 Lichfield City is close to the West Midlands conurbation with good connections to the national transport network. It has a high level of car drivers, with travel by car accounting for 75% of journeys to work. Lichfield already experiences delays and unreliability with congestion forecast to increase as a result of the levels of housing and employment growth being proposed. Improvements to the walking and cycling network have been minimal over recent years with investment instead, focussing on enhancing public transport.

3.17 Lichfield is generally considered to be a prosperous area with higher than average household incomes and does not suffer from the same high levels of excess weight and low activity as found in most of the other urban areas.

3.18 The aim is to ensure walking and cycling investment supports economic growth by helping to transform the City environment and by providing high quality sustainable transport corridors linking to the two rail stations (Lichfield City and Lichfield Trent Valley) and to Strategic Housing Development Locations. Lichfield City Centre Masterplan includes specific reference to improving sustainable connectivity and following the completion of Lichfield Southern Bypass it is expected that a much more attractive environment will be created in the City Centre making it more pleasant for pedestrians and cyclists.

Newcastle-under-Lyme

3.19 Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent are located within the same conurbation in the north of Staffordshire. Walking and cycling investment in Newcastle-under-Lyme has focused on key radial cycle routes and public realm within the town. Traffic problems within the area has resulted in the designation of Air Quality Management Areas and a Ministerial Direction from Government to reduce air pollution in certain areas by 2022, predominantly along the A53 corridor.

3.20 Cycling and walking investment needs to build on the improvements already made in the town and support the funding that is expected to emerge through the Town Deal and Future High Street Funds, promoting economic growth and supporting the growing student population.
Stafford

3.21 Stafford is situated in the centre of the county with the M6 and West Coast Mainline providing good strategic connections to both the north and south of the Country. Stafford has seen recent retail growth in the town centre together with the development of new business parks on the edge of the urban area, which are within cycling distance for many residents. Further investment in the town is expected through the Future High Streets Fund.

3.22 Significant investment has been made in the walking and cycling network in recent years and some headway has been made in encouraging modal shift to sustainable transport modes. This momentum needs to be maintained through further enhancements to walking and cycling infrastructure. This will need to support the continued growth in the town as well as Strategic Development Locations which will include over 5,000 new homes. However, due to the relative concentrations of employment and services located in Stafford, congestion is a concern on main radial routes during peak periods. The completion of the Stafford Western Access Route will help to remove traffic from the town centre and provide a more attractive environment for pedestrians and cyclists.

3.23 Stafford rail station is Staffordshire’s largest rail station with a footfall of nearly 2.5 million in 2018/19 and this is expected to continue growing. Car-parking at the Station is already regularly at capacity so it will be important to encourage as many passengers as possible to access the station by foot or bicycle.

Tamworth

3.24 Tamworth is located close to the West Midlands conurbation. The local cycle network is extensive covering 30 miles within a 12 square mile area and positive progress in encouraging modal shift has been achieved in recent years. Enhancements have been made to the walking and cycling network that links Ventura Retail Park, the town centre and the rail station which is already well used by cyclists. New walking and cycling infrastructure will need to complement investment through the Future High Streets Fund.

3.25 Job opportunities are high when you consider the good public transport access to the West Midlands. However, Tamworth continues to suffer from areas of congestion which will worsen in corridors that link to planned housing and employment sites. The car continues to be relied upon for short trips and longer commuter trips to the West Midlands. Achieving modal shift from the car to walking, cycling and rail for longer trips will be important going forward.
Figure 3.6: Stafford Urban Area

Town Centre Inset
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4. Policy Framework

National Objectives

4.1 National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) states that planning policies should provide for high quality walking and cycling networks and supporting facilities such as cycle parking (drawing on Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans).

4.2 The Government’s Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy (CWIS) supports the transformation of local areas: change which will tackle congestion, change which will extend opportunity to improve physical and mental health, and change which will support local economies.

4.3 The Strategy’s objectives, by 2020, are to:

- Increase cycling activity, where cycling activity is measured as the estimated total number of cycle stages made
- Increase walking activity, where walking activity is measured as the total number of walking stages per person
- Reduce the rate of cyclists killed or seriously injured on England’s roads, measured as the number of fatalities and serious injuries per billion miles cycled
- Increase the percentage of children aged 5 to 10 that usually walk to school

4.4 Further to this, the following aims and target have been set, respectively, to 2025:

- To aim to double cycling, where cycling activity is measured as the estimated total number of cycle stages made each year, from 0.8 billion stages in 2013 to 1.6 billion stages in 2025, and to work towards developing the evidence base over the next year
- To aim to increase walking activity, where walking activity is measured as the total number of walking stages per person per year, to 300 stages per person per year in 2025, and to work towards developing the evidence base over the next year
- To increase the percentage of children aged 5 to 10 that usually walk to school from 49% in 2014 to 55% in 2025

4.5 By 2040, the Government’s ambition is to deliver:

Better Safety

- Streets where cyclists and walkers feel they belong, and are safe
- Better connected communities
- Safer traffic speeds, with lower speed limits where appropriate to the local area
- Cycle training opportunities for all children
Better Mobility

- More high quality cycling facilities
- More urban areas that are considered walkable
- Rural roads which provide improved safety for walking and cycling
- More networks of routes around public transport hubs and town centres, with safe paths along busy roads
- Better links to schools and workplaces
- Technological innovations that can promote more and safer walking and cycling
- Behaviour change opportunities to support increased walking and cycling
- Better integrated routes for those with disabilities or health conditions

Better Streets

- Places designed for people of all abilities and ages so they can choose to walk or cycle with ease
- Improved public realm
- Better planning for walking and cycling
- More community-based activities, such as led rides and play streets where local places want them
- A wider green network of paths, routes and open spaces

4.6 Staffordshire’s LCWIP will help to deliver the Government’s Strategy and contribute towards achieving its targets.

Local Objectives

Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent LEP

4.7 The LCWIP will help to deliver sustainable access to local jobs, as recognised in the Strategic Economic Plans and Local Industrial Strategies for Stoke-on-Trent and Staffordshire Local Enterprise Partnership and the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership. The future prosperity of the Staffordshire economy will be dependent on sustainable growth in the main urban centres at Stafford, Burton upon Trent, Cannock, Lichfield, Tamworth and Newcastle-under-Lyme.

Staffordshire County Council Strategic Plan (2018-2022)

4.8 The LCWIP will help to deliver the County Council Strategic Plan vision and outcomes of:

‘A county where big ambitions, great connections and greener living give everyone the opportunity to prosper, be healthy and happy’

Everyone in Staffordshire will:

- Have access to more good jobs and share the benefits of economic growth
• Be healthier and independent for longer
• Feel safer, happier and more supported in their community

4.9 The LCWIP will also support the following priorities, as identified in the Strategic Plan:

• Help Staffordshire’s economy to grow and generate more good jobs
• Invest in infrastructure for growing communities
• Improve education and training so that life-long learning offers everyone the opportunity to succeed
• Inspire healthy, independent living
• Support more families and children to look after themselves, stay safe and well

District / Borough Integrated Transport Strategies

4.10 The Local Transport Plan for Staffordshire comprises of eight District/Borough Integrated Transport Strategies. Each Integrated Transport Strategy considers all aspects of the transport system, including the local highway, trunk/motorway and rail networks. Traffic congestion, sustainable transport provision, car parking, road safety and road maintenance are all considered, together with social issues including air quality, health and accessibility. The LCWIP will be integrated within these strategies as they are refreshed.

4.11 The Integrated Transport Strategies inform the Local Plan process and priorities are delivered through the County Council’s Capital programme. A value management approach is adopted for highway maintenance activities through a priority scoring matrix, giving a high priority to schemes that deliver safety benefits. Through partnership working, the County Council influences the capital programmes managed by Highways England and the Rail Industry.

Local Plans

4.12 It is the intention that LCWIP recommendations feed into six of the eight Local Plans that cover Staffordshire. The current Local Plan polices and proposals that have an outcome related to walking and cycling are summarised in Appendix A.
5. Network Planning for Cycling and Walking

Introduction

5.1 This chapter summarises the GIS analysis undertaken by PJA, managed by Associate Director, Adrian Lord, and in consultation with Sustrans Network development Manager, Edward Healey. A Technical Note produced by PJA is provided in Appendix B. The analysis has determined the cycle network that has the highest cycling demand in the six urban areas, to be taken forward for auditing. Routes with the highest cycling demand have been further prioritised based on the following five criteria:

- Proximity to new employment
- New schools (20,000 extra places by 2031),
- Rail stations
- Locations of personal injury accidents involving vulnerable road users
- Locations with currently low provision for cyclists

5.2 The walking audit focuses on the six town centres. The town centres have been identified as the core walking zones as they are where the greatest number of walking trip generators are located close together and where all pedestrian infrastructure is deemed to be important.

Origin-Destination Analysis

5.3 The identification of cycling demand focuses on the mapping of the main origin and destination points across the six urban areas, with trip origin points being the main residential areas. Commuter and school trips were considered, together with forecast future trip demand from proposed new residential development sites. Journeys considered short enough to be cycled were estimated to be no more than 5km or 20 minutes.

Commuter Trips

5.4 2011 Census data was used to map the Location of Usual Residence and Place of Work at the Lower Super Output Area (LSOA) level and the average mode share for cyclists was applied to the total number of commuters. These trips were assigned to the shortest routes on the network.

School Trips

5.5 An average walking, cycling and scooting mode share of 49% for primary schools and 51% for secondary schools was applied to school journeys under 5km. These trips were assigned to the shortest routes on the network.
Forecast Future Demand

5.6 Potential trip rates from proposed new residential areas were estimated using TRICS and, by using Census journey to work data, it was calculated that 32% of these trips would be under 5km. The forecast cycle mode share was applied to the demand and the trips were assigned to the shortest routes on the network.

Cycle Route Prioritisation

5.7 All sections of the network with over 101 cycle to work journeys forecast per day (including those from future housing) were selected to be put forward for further prioritisation, as were all sections with over 101 cycle, walk or scoot school journeys per day. These sections of the network were further prioritised to help determine which sections of this defined network should be the focus of short, medium or long term spend on new or improved cycle infrastructure.

5.8 Five factors were chosen to help inform the prioritisation of future spend. The result for each priority was standardised between 0-1 to give every dataset an equal weighting. For the five factors, 1 is the highest rating which represents:

- Closest proximity to employment development
- Closest proximity to new schools
- The highest number of cycle trips to rail stations
- Closest proximity to personal injury accident data including cyclists
- The least dense cycle network identified through Mesh density analysis

5.9 Rail forms part of the mode share for journeys to work in all six urban areas and is particularly popular in Lichfield where 7% travel to work by rail (Census 2011). There is therefore the potential demand for journeys to the origin station to be made by bike. This demand was considered in the prioritisation process. The analysis assumed that 3km would reflect an average home to station cycle distance and the place of work would need to be within a 10-minute walk of the destination station. These cycle trips were assigned to the shortest routes on the network.

5.10 Gap analysis of the cycle network was considered in the prioritisation process and was undertaken using Mesh Density analysis which is the measure of the proximity of cycle routes to each other and how easy it is to reach them.

5.11 The final prioritised cycle networks for the six urban areas are shown on Figures 5.1 to 5.6. The total priority for each link was calculated from the standardised values giving a maximum possible value of 5 (a maximum rating of 1 for each of the five factors).

5.12 Table 5.1 provides a comparison between the six urban areas in terms of the length of routes with a cycling demand of over 101 journeys per day and how these lengths have been broken down further in terms of highest and lowest priority ranking.
Table 5.1 shows that Burton upon Trent has the greatest length of cycle network that includes links with over 101 cycle journeys per day and Lichfield has the lowest. Even though Lichfield has the shortest network, there are no links within the lower priority rankings. Only Lichfield, Cannock and Burton upon Trent have lengths of network that have been identified as having the highest priority ranking. The networks in Newcastle-under-Lyme, Stafford and Tamworth generally have a medium level ranking, with Stafford having the greatest length of network within the lower priority band.
Figure 5.1: Prioritised Cycle Network for Burton upon Trent
Figure 5.2: Prioritised Cycle Network for Cannock
Figure 5.3: Prioritised Cycle Network for Lichfield
Figure 5.4: Prioritised Cycle Network for Newcastle-under-Lyme
Figure 5.5: Prioritised Cycle Network for Stafford
Figure 5.6: Prioritised Cycle Network for Tamworth
Walkable Town Centres

5.14 An initial GIS analysis was completed by PJA to help understand the walking demand throughout the six urban areas. It was assumed that walking journeys would be up to 2km which equates to approximately 25 minutes. 2011 Census data was used to map the Location of Usual Residence and Place of Work at the Lower Super Output Area (LSOA) level and the average mode share for pedestrians was applied to the total number of commuters. These trips were assigned to the shortest routes on the network.

5.15 The results of this analysis provided an indication of the most likely walking routes from residential areas to employment sites throughout the urban areas. The volume of pedestrians on these routes was not significantly high in comparison to the levels of pedestrian activity within town centres that tend to be the focus of retail and leisure trips, as well as employment trips. It was therefore concluded that the auditing process should primarily focus on town centres where there is the greatest footfall. Future reviews of the LCWIP could include further analysis of walking commuter routes.

5.16 For the purpose of the LCWIP, the town centres are defined as the core walking zones where the greatest number of walking trip attractors are located close together and where all pedestrian infrastructure is deemed to be important. Although a comprehensive walking network exists within the town centres, there are locations that deter pedestrians due to the need for crossing facilities, poor design and maintenance. The focus of Staffordshire’s LCWIP is to enhance the existing town centre networks to attract more footfall and encourage regeneration and economic growth.
6. **Priority Cycle Route Audit**

**Methodology**

6.1 The routes identified with the highest cycle demand were audited and measures have been identified to improve the routes. The audit involved extensive site surveys and every route was cycled by Sustrans or PJA officers. If it was considered that a route cannot be improved to an acceptable level, the next most direct route was assessed. The audit focused on the five core design outcomes presented in the LCWIP guidance:

- A coherent network with a consistent route quality and easy to navigate
- A direct and fast route between origins and destinations
- A network that is through an environment that feels safe and removes conflicts with motor vehicles
- A network that is smooth and comfortable to ride
- An attractive network that makes cycling a pleasurable activity

**Summary of Findings**

6.2 The outcome of the audit is detailed in Appendix C which includes a Cycle Route Audit Report for each of the urban areas. They were produced by Sustrans and PJA and the issues that they identify are summarised in paragraphs 6.3 to 6.8.

**Burton upon Trent**

6.3 Burton upon Trent has the longest priority network. Footways are wide enough for conversion on routes such as Burton Road and Branston Road to shared use, however there are often sections where the footway narrows or there is parking demand. Where road space is not available, quiet parallel residential streets are often the only option for enhancing cycling provision, but many of these routes suffer from significant on-street parking and traffic speeds do not aid safe cycling. Routes around the hospital are particularly impacted by on-street parking. Traffic-free paths are available on short sections of the network, particularly around Wellington Road, Anglesey Street and in the Shobnall area, but they often have poor surfacing and lighting.

**Cannock**

6.4 The priority routes in Cannock are predominantly residential roads with varying degrees of scope to widen footways. Many roads, such as New Penkridge Road, Pye Green Road, Stafford Road and Hednesford Road are long and straight which can encourage high vehicle speeds. On the quieter residential roads there are a few locations where adjacent landscaped areas (Chenet Way) and off-road paths exist, but it is also common to observe on-street parking with just standard footways. Closer to the town centre, pedestrian subways exclude cycling and footway cycling is often observed.
Lichfield

6.5 Lichfield has the shortest priority route network. On busy corridors such as Eastern Avenue, A5127 and A51 there are opportunities for sections of shared provision. One location requiring improvement is near to The Friary School, Eastern Avenue. The conversion of footway to shared provision often needs to be combined with quiet way treatment on residential roads, with some distributor roads requiring speed reduction measures. At a limited number of locations, there is the opportunity to use cut-through paths, for example between Beacon Park and Christchurch Lane. There are instances where current provision is confusing and does not meet current guidelines, for example on Birmingham Road, and there are incomplete facilities linking to new development, particularly in the vicinity of Watery Lane.

Newcastle-under-Lyme

6.6 The majority of the priority cycle routes in Newcastle are on heavily trafficked ‘A’ roads with large roundabouts to negotiate, for example the A34 dual carriageway, A525 and A53. Sections of the A34 have no existing footways and crossing facilities on the ring road are dominated by subways with no cycling facilities. At certain locations, the required carriageway width is available to construct new cycle facilities, although often the only option is to consider quieter parallel routes that can be less direct. There are constraints on these routes, such as property boundaries and on-street parking.

Stafford

6.7 Off-road cycle routes already exist on some priority routes however facilities have not been adequately maintained both in terms of surfacing and vegetation clearance. There are locations, such as Tixall Road and Beaconside where urgent maintenance is required. Barriers exist that are difficult to negotiate and rail bridges on Doxey Road, Newport Road and Wolverhampton Road limit the width available for cycle route provision. There are many gaps in the network where road widths are narrow and on-street parking occurs. The town centre pedestrian priority area has been identified on the priority network where cycling is prohibited. Conversely, corridors such as the A34 Lichfield Road benefit from high quality off-road parallel routes that make use of paths along the river.

Tamworth

6.8 High quality cycle routes already exist on many of the priority routes, including off-road routes around the castle, however funding has not been available to adequately maintain the surfacing. There is also more scope for the implementation of additional shared use facilities within roadside verges, compared to the other five urban areas, particularly linking to development sites. Close to the town centre there are narrower sections of priority cycle route where new facilities would be difficult to deliver, such as Lichfield Street and Aldergate and there are residential areas, particularly at Kettlebrook Road where on-street parking limits the opportunity for cycle provision.
7. Core Walking Zone Audit

Methodology

7.1 The audit has identified where improvements to pedestrian infrastructure in the six town centres are required. All routes within the town centres where both pedestrians and vehicles are accommodated were audited on foot by Sustrans or PJA officers. Where several minor improvements have been identified in the same area or route, schemes have been amalgamated into a package of works, to ensure individual measures are implemented together and achieve complementary benefits and synergies. The audit focused on:

- **Attractiveness** – maintenance, fear of crime, traffic noise and pollution
- **Comfort** – condition, footway width, width of staggered crossings/pedestrian refuges, footway parking and gradient
- **Directness** – footway provision, location of crossings in relation to desire lines, gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing) and green man time
- **Safety** – traffic volume, traffic speed and visibility
- **Coherence** – dropped kerbs and tactile paving

Summary of Findings

7.2 The outcome of the audit is detailed in Appendix D which includes a Walking Zone Audit Report for each of the town centres, produced by Sustrans and PJA. Table 7.1 provides a summary of the overall performance of the routes in each town. The scoring excludes town centre locations that are already traffic-free where improvements are not expected to be required. Overall, Stafford receives the highest score. Newcastle’s low score is attributed to the inclusion of the heavily trafficked ring road within the audit.

**Table 7.1: Overall performance of town centre routes (excluding areas that are already traffic-free)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town centre</th>
<th>Attractiveness</th>
<th>Comfort</th>
<th>Directness</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Coherence</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burton upon Trent</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannock</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichfield</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle-under-Lyme</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamworth</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Burton upon Trent**

### 7.3

16 town centre routes shared by vehicles and pedestrians were audited. Many streets are considered to have below the minimum level of provision, hence requiring improvement, the exception being the low trafficked streets of Manor Drive, Abbey Street and Meadowside Drive. The five routes considered to have the greatest pedestrian / vehicle conflict include Union Street, Orchard Street, Guild Street, Borough Road and Horninglow Street. The need for improved dropped kerbs and tactile paving is common on most routes. Footway maintenance is a concern on Guild Street, High Street, Orchard Street, Green Street, Fleet Street, Bond Street and Abbey Street and footway widths are inadequate on sections of High Street, Station Street, Lichfield Street and New Street. The route with the lowest overall score is Lichfield Street.

**Cannock**

### 7.4

13 town centre routes shared by vehicles and pedestrians were audited. Although many routes have a high level of provision, such as Beecroft Road, Allport Road, Wolverhampton Road and High Green, improvements are recommended on 11 routes. Poor footway maintenance is identified on Stafford Road, Brunswick Road, Church Street and Walsall Road. Footway width is an issue on Stafford Road, Walsall Road, High Green and Park Road. Missing dropped kerbs and tactile paving, along with street clutter are general concerns.

**Lichfield**

### 7.5

Out of the 13 town centre routes shared by vehicles and pedestrians that were audited, Bore Street, Dam Street and Tamworth Street received the maximum score in terms of level of provision for pedestrians. Other routes, such as The Close, Greenhill and Lombard Street, would benefit from footway widening, and footway maintenance is an issue on The Friary, Sandford Street, St John’s Street and Swan Road. Recommendations are made to reduce pedestrian waiting times on the more heavily trafficked routes such as Birmingham Road. Where possible, pedestrian crossing distances at junctions should be reduced and match desire lines. The route with the lowest overall score is St John’s Street.

**Newcastle-under-Lyme**

### 7.6

Eight town centre routes shared by vehicles and pedestrians were audited and require improvement. The streetscape on Merrial Street, Liverpool Road, Hassell Street and Friars Street is the main issue within the ring road. Footways around the ring road are the greatest cause for concern and at the access points from the ring road to the town centre. Ryecroft, Lower Street and Barracks Road are significantly below the minimum level of provision. The audit also noted areas of narrow footway and limited crossing facilities on Pool Dam and Brook Lane located outside the ring road.
**Stafford**

7.7 Stafford town centre received the highest performance scores out of all six towns. Out of the 18 routes shared by vehicles and pedestrians, only seven require improvements for pedestrians. This includes North Walls, Eastgate Street, Salter Street, Broad Eye, Chell Road, Victoria Road and Station Road. Four of these routes will be relieved by the construction of the Stafford Western Access Route which is currently under construction and expected to be open in 2021. The most significant issues relate to footway maintenance, lack of tactile paving and dropped kerbs, footway width and crossing facilities.

**Tamworth**

7.8 13 town centre streets shared by vehicles and pedestrians were audited, with Victoria Road receiving the highest performance score and Lower Gungate, Upper Gungate and Marmion Street receiving the lowest scores. Poor footway maintenance was highlighted on Church Street, Marmion Street, Albert Road, Spinning School Lane, with Albion Street also experiencing drainage issues. Footway width is a concern on Church Street, Lichfield Street, Lower Gungate, Marmion Street and Albion Street. Narrow footways were raised as an issue on the numerous routes that provide vehicle access to car parks. Limited visibility created by the high volume of buses on Corporation Street is a concern. Improved crossing provision at side roads is often required and signal crossing waiting times are a concern on Upper Gungate.
8. Prioritised Programme of Scheme Delivery

Introduction

8.1 The auditing of the priority cycling routes and core walking zones has identified a long list of around 200 potential infrastructure improvements within the six urban areas. The cycling schemes include:

- New lengths of shared walking / cycle paths
- Quiet way treatment and traffic calming
- Toucan crossing facilities
- Narrowing of junctions and entry treatments
- Enhanced condition of existing cycle routes
- Improved signage and wayfinding
- Cycling through vehicle-restricted areas

8.2 Walking schemes focus on making town centre environments more attractive, comfortable, direct, safe and coherent and include:

- New pedestrian crossings
- Resurfaced footways
- Widened footways
- Enhanced crossing facilities by increasing width and crossing times
- Reduced traffic speed
- Relocation of street furniture
- General improvements to the public realm

8.3 The 200 potential schemes have been prioritised based on their ability to benefit the greatest number of cyclists and pedestrians and achieve the objectives of improving sustainable connectivity and safety. Where possible, the scoring process has been automated using the outputs from the GIS analysis undertaken by PJA. The indicative value for money and feasibility of the scheme has also been considered based on conceptual design ideas. The scheme prioritisation is based on the following:

- Effectiveness of Scheme
- Fit with Policy
- Economic Impact
- Scheme Deliverability

Effectiveness of Scheme

8.4 The effectiveness of the scheme is dictated by the cycling demand on the route that the proposal intends to improve. Schemes have been given a score between 1 and 5 based on the outputs of the GIS analysis produced by PJA. The score takes account of the following journey types:

- Cycle to work journeys per day – commuter journeys under 5km
• Cycle/walk to school journeys per day – school journeys under 5km
• Forecast cycle demand from new developments

8.5 The effectiveness of schemes within the town centres that improves provision for pedestrians has been scored in terms of the pedestrian demand along the route and its likelihood to improve the journey to work by walking.

**Fit with Policy**

8.6 All of the 200 schemes fit with the three interconnected priority outcomes of the County Council’s Strategy Plan for up to 2022:

• Be able to access more good jobs and feel the benefit of economic growth
• Be healthier and more independent
• Feel safer, happier and more supported in and by their community

8.7 It was agreed with Sustrans and PJA that the policy scoring process should be based on measurable policies that, by 2040, aim to deliver Better Safety, Better Mobility and Better Streets, in line with LCWIP guidance. The outputs of the GIS analysis that align with these ambitions and have been used as part of the scoring process are summarised in Table 8.2.

**Table 8.2: Policy Criteria of Scoring Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy scoring criterion</th>
<th>LCWIP Ambitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connects to rail</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to new jobs and schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves safety</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances cycle network density</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances walking zone</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.8 Table 8.3 summarises how the cycling schemes are scored in terms of helping to achieve the five policy criteria and LCWIP ambitions. The location of a scheme that corresponds with a section of the network that has the greatest ability to benefit the policy criteria has been given the highest score. As part of the GIS analysis, the score for connecting to rail; proximity to new jobs and schools; improving safety and enhancing cycle network density was standardised between 0-1 to provide each dataset with an equal weighting.

8.9 A high scoring cycling scheme is achieved under the following scenario:

• Scheme on a section of network with the greatest number of cycle-rail trips
• Scheme on a section of network with the greatest number of cycling trips from proposed new employment and new schools
• Scheme at a location where there is limited existing cycling facilities
• Scheme located near to recorded personal injury accidents involving cyclists
Table 8.3: Policy Scoring Process for Cycling Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connects to rail</td>
<td>≤0.25</td>
<td>≤0.50</td>
<td>≤0.75</td>
<td>≤1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to new jobs</td>
<td>≤0.25</td>
<td>≤0.50</td>
<td>≤0.75</td>
<td>≤1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to new schools</td>
<td>≤0.25</td>
<td>≤0.50</td>
<td>≤0.75</td>
<td>≤1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves safety</td>
<td>≤0.25</td>
<td>≤0.50</td>
<td>≤0.75</td>
<td>≤1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances cycle network density</td>
<td>≤0.25</td>
<td>≤0.50</td>
<td>≤0.75</td>
<td>≤1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.10 Walking schemes were scored based on the criteria used in the LCWIP walking route selection tool. A high scoring walking scheme is achieved under the following scenario:

- Scheme that improve the attractiveness, comfort, directness, safety and coherence of town centre streets
- Scheme that improves connectivity to rail
- Scheme that improves connectivity to jobs and schools
- Scheme that improves safety for pedestrians

**Economic Impact**

8.11 An indicative appraisal has been completed for all scheme to help identify which improvements are likely to represent high value for money. The appraisal is based on the likely number of users compared to the likely cost of the scheme.

**Scheme Deliverability**

8.12 Based on the County Council’s previous experience of delivering walking and cycling schemes, the key criteria to deliverability is the extent to which the scheme can be delivered within the existing public highway boundary; likely political and stakeholder support for the scheme; and the ability for the scheme to attract funding.

8.13 Schemes that can clearly be delivered within the highway boundary score the highest in terms of deliverability. Proposals receive a lower score if delivery will be delayed by the following:

- Land acquisition
- Agreements required with other delivery organisations such as Network Rail, Highways England, Local Planning Authorities and Canal and River Trust
- Complex and more costly schemes that depend on the completion of full business cases and bidding processes

8.14 Schemes have the greatest potential to attract funding are scored higher. The existing funding streams that are available to the County Council include:

- Integrated transport block funding allocated through a political approval process
• ‘Needs-based’ maintenance capital block funding
• S106 funds received through planning obligations
• S278 funds received via planning conditions
• Community Infrastructure Funds managed by District/Borough Councils

Indicative Programme of Schemes

8.15 It is considered that in order for Staffordshire County Council to have the ability to help the government achieve its ambition of Better Safety, Better Mobility and Better Streets, around £31m investment is required up to 2030/31 on the priority cycle networks and core walking zones in Burton upon Trent, Cannock, Lichfield, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Stafford and Tamworth. As required by LCWIP guidance, the 200 schemes have been allocated for short, medium or long-term delivery during the period up to 2030/31, as identified in Appendix E. The programme will be subject to ongoing review, following the outcome of consultations, detailed designs and the announcement of funding streams.

8.16 Delivery in the short-term up to 2023/24 includes schemes that achieve the highest score in the prioritisation process. Generally, these schemes are within the existing highway boundary, but delivery will be dependent on the availability of funding resources. All other schemes are likely to require significant levels of additional funding and are expected to have a longer lead-in period due to the size and complexity of the proposal, including potential land acquisition and buy-in from politicians and partner organisations.

8.17 All schemes proposed in the core walking zones are recommended for delivery in either the short or medium-term up to 2027/28. Although schemes proposed for the long-term up to 2030/31 are on the priority cycle network where there is a significant cycle demand, they are not on the routes that are currently expected to attract the highest demand. Cycle improvements expected to be delivered in the long-term tend to be more aspirational and await a defined solution.

8.18 Staffordshire County Council has allocated around £1.164m to progress delivery of short-term commitments that were already under development on the priority cycle network and within the core walking zones prior to the publication of the LCWIP, as indicated in Table 8.4. This includes a funding commitment of £508,000 awarded by Sustrans to complete a cycling/public realm scheme in Stafford town centre along South Walls. The scheme was not included in the LCWIP auditing process as the scheme is already a commitment.
Table 8.4: Short-term Committed Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Costs (£000)</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>South Walls shared cycle route, Stafford</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>Sustrans/S106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7TC</td>
<td>B5000 G lascote Road traffic calming and cycle route, Tamworth</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>S106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2TC</td>
<td>Comberford Rd / Coton Lane speed reduction and cycle routes, Tamworth</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>S106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2TW</td>
<td>Corporation St/Church St pedestrian improvements, Tamworth</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>S106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3TC</td>
<td>Ashby Road toucan crossing, Tamworth</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>S106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BC</td>
<td>Waterloo Road traffic calming, Burton</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>IT Block/S106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3BC</td>
<td>Branston Road shared use/footway widening, Burton</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>S106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3BW</td>
<td>New Street/Worthington Way/High St pedestrian scheme, Burton</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>S106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21BC</td>
<td>A444 cycle route, Burton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>S106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4BC</td>
<td>Shobnall Road traffic calming, Burton</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>S106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.19 The ranking provided in Appendix E indicates that around £2.07m walking schemes and £3.17m cycling schemes should be considered as a priority for delivery in the short term up to 2023/24. The proposed schemes are listed in Table 8.5 and 8.6.

Table 8.5: Town Centre Walking Zone Short Term Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2BW</td>
<td>Union Street, Burton</td>
<td>Remove pavement obstructions, enhance tactile paving, consider cycling provision (linked to 17BC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4BW</td>
<td>Orchard Street, Burton</td>
<td>Improve surfacing, remove pavement obstructions, improve pedestrian crossing times, tactile paving, consider cycle provision (linked to 17BC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6BW</td>
<td>Lichfield Street, Burton</td>
<td>Widen footway, remove obstructions and vegetation, wider pedestrian refuge, consider pedestrian desire lines at Lichfield St / High Street junction, wider refuges at Park Street, slow speeds, tactile paving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14BW</td>
<td>Borough Road, Burton</td>
<td>Rationalise street furniture, enhance space at crossing points, reduce pedestrian delay at traffic signals, speed enforcement, tactile paving, consider cycle provision (linked to 10BC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2CW</td>
<td>Brunswick Road, Cannock</td>
<td>Maintenance works to footways at side road crossings to improve surfacing and reduce trip hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5CW</td>
<td>Church Street (north), Cannock</td>
<td>Surface maintenance on footway crossing points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9CW</td>
<td>Walsall Road, Cannock</td>
<td>A34 Walsall Road/A4601 Avon Rd junction requires general removal of street clutter to widen footways and remove obstacles. Surface maintenance and new tactile paving should be considered where appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13CW</td>
<td>Park Road, Cannock</td>
<td>De-clutter Park Road in vicinity of bus station, consider removal of guardrail where appropriate (safety audit). Implement tactile paving where required. Footway widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8LW</td>
<td>St John’s Street, Lichfield</td>
<td>Footway maintenance, speed reduction measures, improved pedestrian crossing provision and narrowing of junctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3NW</td>
<td>Church Street and Merrial Street, Newcastle</td>
<td>There are no pedestrian crossing points or dropped kerbs along Merrial St apart from at the junction with High St. Proposed crossing at northern end of Merrial Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5NW</td>
<td>Ryecroft, Newcastle</td>
<td>Side road crossings not in line with desire line. Replace current two-stage crossing with single stage parallel ped and cycle signalised crossings. Improve and widen shared footway/cycle tracks to link to adjacent streets. Consider cycle provision (linked to 3NC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7NW</td>
<td>Barracks Road, Newcastle</td>
<td>Links are unpleasant due to lack of active frontage and proximity of traffic. Subways at regular intervals (each major junction) but not pleasant. Improve subway entrances from footways by widening, guardrail removal, planting etc. Dropped kerbs/tactile paving or entry treatments to reduce crossing distance at side roads. Hassell St crossing needs to be a single stage toucan to accommodate cycle traffic - needs footway widening on Hassell St (east) - see also cycle audit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5SW</td>
<td>Salter Street, Stafford</td>
<td>Flush paving has no edge marking for visially impaired users along the retail area. Footway maintenance required from North Walls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7SW</td>
<td>Broad Eye, Stafford</td>
<td>Footway widening and review of crossing facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Footway and vegetation maintenance, footway widening at bus stop, improved visibility at service area access, improved ped crossing timings. Consider cycle provision (linked to 20SC)

Footway maintenance, wider footways, marked disabled bays. The road is a route out from Corporation Street for buses. Double yellow lines parked on regularly by disabled badge holders. This restricts visibility for pedestrians. The Corporation Street crossing point is set well back from Church Street.

Provide more direct route for pedestrians and improve crossing facilities. The taxi rank and turning area creates a significant diversion for pedestrians and crossing the road involves negotiating buses.

Extend pedestrian crossing time, dropped crossing and tactile paving. The footway narrows where parking places are provided. Traffic flows and speeds can seem high on this route around the town centre.

Reduce pavement obstructions, reduce waiting times for pedestrians and improve tactile paving. Reduce the width of the wide access to Morrisons. Consider cycle provision (linked to 4TC)

---

### Table 8.6: Priority Cycle Network Short Term Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3BC</td>
<td>B5018 Burton Road / Branston Road, Burton</td>
<td>Shared use, footway widening on rail bridge and use of quiet residential streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4BC</td>
<td>Shobnall Road, Burton</td>
<td>Corridor quiet way solution and traffic calming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8BC</td>
<td>Grange Street, Burton</td>
<td>20mph speed limit and traffic calming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15BC</td>
<td>Blackpool St / Trent St, Burton</td>
<td>20mph speed limit and traffic calming (parking bays on alternate side of road).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24BC</td>
<td>Bearwood Hill Road / Himington Street, Burton</td>
<td>Quiet way treatment on alternative routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BC</td>
<td>Waterloo Street, Burton</td>
<td>20mph speed limit and traffic calming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13CC</td>
<td>Hemlock Way / Keys Park Road, Cannock</td>
<td>Both Hemlock Way and Keys Park Road footways and verge are suitable for shared use. Toucan crossing on the Hill Street arm of the junction would make a route along Hemlock Way and Keys Park Road viable. Some widening work of the footway at the corner of Hill Street and Keys Park Way would also be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14CC</td>
<td>Wimblebury Road, Cannock</td>
<td>20mph speed limit and crossing points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16CC</td>
<td>Hednesford Road (North), Cannock</td>
<td>Traffic calming and 20mph and cycle route on residential roads to rear of school linking to Bank Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20CC</td>
<td>Lichfield Road, Cannock</td>
<td>Provision of shared use facilities on the north side of the road by removing existing grass verge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4LC</td>
<td>Broad Lane, Lichfield</td>
<td>Signage and quiet way treatment on a quiet residential street that is already traffic calmed with build-outs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8LC</td>
<td>Friary Road, Lichfield</td>
<td>Maintenance of existing facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13LC</td>
<td>Eastern Avenue (near The Friary School), Lichfield</td>
<td>Shared use on north side and incorporate cycle provision at crossings. New shared use footway/ cycleway is required on the north side of Eastern Avenue to support existing journeys from the residential areas south of Eastern Avenue to The Friary School, Friary Grange Leisure Centre and the care home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17LC/ 19LC</td>
<td>Curborough Road / St Chads Road</td>
<td>A quietway treatment to highlight the cycle route further and other options such as filtered permeability by controlling vehicle access with one-way streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18LC</td>
<td>Greenhill / George Lane (link to 12LW)</td>
<td>Alternative signed route from Rotten Row into the City Centre and avoiding Greenhill. There are no cycle facilities and other alternative routes should be explored to achieve an access into and out of the city centre at this point. Options include utilising the proposed cycle route improvements along Birmingham Road to sign a route from Rotten Row into the city centre and avoiding Greenhill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6NC</td>
<td>A52 Brunswick St and George St, Newcastle</td>
<td>Light segregation to protect cycle lanes and parallel crossing for access to the two-way cycle track and links to existing signed routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11NC</td>
<td>Knutton Rd, Pool Dam, Keele Rd and Greenway, Newcastle</td>
<td>Orme Road quiet parallel route, cycle crossing Pool Dam and Blackfriars Road to serve Greenway, parallel zebra crossing on Keele Road in vicinity of Orme Rd, track resurfacing north west of Orme Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SC</td>
<td>Sandon Road (north), Stafford</td>
<td>New barriers, resurfacing and vegetation clearance providing improved cycle access but prohibiting vehicular access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SC</td>
<td>Beaconside (south), Stafford</td>
<td>Toucan crossing at Weston Road roundabout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9SC</td>
<td>Bridge Street / Greengate St / Gaolgate St, Stafford</td>
<td>Revised Traffic Regulation Order to allow cyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11SC</td>
<td>Radford Bank / Weeping Cross, Stafford</td>
<td>Route selection tool should be used to appraise options as alternative off-carriageway route is available. Convert puffin to toucan on Radford Bank. New shared use footway/cycleway not considered deliverable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14SC</td>
<td>Rowley Bank, Stafford</td>
<td>Quietway treatment to adjacent route on Brook Glen Rd/Rowley Grove.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20SC</td>
<td>Chell Road (links to 8SW), Stafford</td>
<td>Shared use following delivery of the Stafford Western Access Route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25SC</td>
<td>Corporation Street, Stafford</td>
<td>Quiet way behind houses adjacent to allotment, enhancing signing and route visibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27SC</td>
<td>Bertelin Road / Oxford Gardens, Stafford</td>
<td>Quiet way that provides alternative to Sandon Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1TC</td>
<td>Coton Lane, Tamworth</td>
<td>Cycle route ends at the first junction with Fontenaye Road. The route should have been constructed as a toucan crossing with linking shared use footway/ cycleway into the development. A short section of footway can be converted to shared use footway/ cycleway to link a quiet service road with segregated cycle route on Coton Lane and a crossing of Comberford Road to the Rawlett School. Improved road markings to existing route, upgrade of existing crossing to toucan and provision of 100 metres of shared use route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5TC</td>
<td>Offadrive, Tamworth</td>
<td>Maintenance required including signing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route Code</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6TC</td>
<td>Bolebridge Street, Tamworth</td>
<td>Segregated off-highway cycle provision is provided alongside Bolebridge Street that only requires minimal maintenance and signing to bring it to a high standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9TC</td>
<td>Florendine St/Woodland Rd, Tamworth</td>
<td>Quietway treatment, new signing and maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13TC</td>
<td>Tamworth Rd to Watling St (off-road), Tamworth</td>
<td>An existing spine route that provides safe off-road cycleway and serves journeys through and to Stoneydelph plus links with similar off-road provision to Tamworth centre. The route is lit but would benefit from maintenance to surface and signing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21TC</td>
<td>Fazeley Rd/Riverdrive, Tamworth</td>
<td>The analysis identifies Riverdrive however there are far better alternative routes already in place that provide the same connectivity as Riverdrive and on a similar alignment. All of these routes would benefit from maintenance improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24TC</td>
<td>Aldergate, Tamworth</td>
<td>Advisory cycle lanes could offer additional comfort for cyclists travelling through however the current highway width means that vehicles cannot pass cyclists and cycle lanes would offer limited benefit. Consider a quietway treatment on Aldergate to allow for additional cycle signage and cycle logos.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Integration and Application

Introduction

9.1 Staffordshire County Council’s Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan is based on robust GIS analysis that provides an evidence base for supporting investment in walking and cycling schemes. The evidence base within the document will help to add weight to the decision to prioritise funding for walking and cycling schemes which is particularly important when there are conflicting interests that could arise through consultation processes. It is expected that the requirements of cyclists and pedestrians identified within the LCWIP will become integral to the transport systems within the six urban centres and embedded in transport schemes such as local safety schemes, junction improvements, street redesigns and maintenance works.

9.2 Staffordshire County Council, in partnership with key stakeholders, has a successful track record in delivering walking and cycling infrastructure funded through IT capital block, developer contributions, bidding opportunities and growth deal funds secured through the Stoke-on-Trent and Staffordshire Local Enterprise Partnership. This is highlighted in Table 9.1 which summarises the level of recent investment in transport schemes that have improved conditions for pedestrians and cyclists. Through the LCWIP process, the County Council is committed to growing this level of investment during the period up to 2030.

Table 9.1: Previous Walking and Cycling Investment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Total five year Spend 2014/15 – 2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burton upon Trent</td>
<td>275,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannock</td>
<td>116,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichfield</td>
<td>524,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle-under-Lyme</td>
<td>1,724,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford</td>
<td>2,300,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamworth</td>
<td>2,062,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,004,676</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excluding footway and cycleway maintenance

Integration with Existing Plans

District/Borough Integrated Transport Strategies

9.3 The LCWIP has considered the main settlements within six of the District/Borough Integrated Transport Strategies. The two remaining strategies cover the more rural Districts of Staffordshire Moorlands and South
Staffordshire. As resources permit, GIS analysis could also be undertaken for the smaller settlement within the more rural areas of Staffordshire and included in future updates of the LCWIP document. The schemes proposed within the LCWIP will become embedded in these strategies.

Local Planning Process

9.4 The County Council actively engages with local planning authorities in Staffordshire on the development of Local Plans. Local Plan teams have accepted the current Integrated Transport Strategies as an important part of the evidence base for their Local Plans. Embedding the outputs from LCWIP into the County Council’s Integrated Transport Strategies is therefore key to integrating LCWIP into policies and proposals within Local Plans.

9.5 At the appropriate stage in the Local Plan review, the County Council will update the Integrated Transport Strategies in line with the LCWIP document. Likewise, as the local planning authorities identify further housing and employment allocations, the LCWIP document will need to be reviewed to reflect possible new routes with high walking and cycling demand. County Council responses to Neighbourhood Plans will also consider LCWIP recommendations.

9.6 Staffordshire County Council, as both the highway and local transport authority, is a statutory consultee on all planning applications. Through the planning consent process, developers will be made aware of the LCWIP and will be required to consider it in the preparation of Transport Assessments and Travel Plans. Through this process, S106 obligations and S278 conditions will be negotiated to reflect the LCWIP. The robust evidence base that has been used to support the LCWIP is expected to make these negotiations more successful in terms of securing developer contributions towards the delivery of the priority cycle networks and walking zones within the six urban areas. Also, as a statutory consultee on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), the County Council will ensure that LCWIP proposals are eligible for CIL, as appropriate.

9.7 Economic regeneration teams at both the District/Borough Councils and the County Council are actively engaged in encouraging the growth and prosperity of the six town centres included in the LCWIP. Strategies are in place to encourage vibrant town centres that are fit for the future. As a result, Stafford, Newcastle-under-Lyme and Tamworth have been successful in reaching the next round of the Future High Street Fund and Burton upon Trent and Newcastle-under-Lyme are eligible for Town Deal funding. The County Council will work with the District/Borough Councils on the highway and transport aspects of these strategies, to promote the recognition of LCWIP recommendations.

Education, Training and Promotion

9.8 The provision of additional revenue resources would enable the County Council to promote and encourage use of new walking and cycling facilities. As schemes within the LCWIP programme are delivered, targeted events and activities would help to achieve increased sustainable travel within the six
urban centres. Community events involving led walks and bike rides could be held, together with training events enabling people to cycle safely and confidently on the new routes. Engagement with local schools and businesses along the routes that have been improved would also be beneficial.

9.9 Bikeability training already takes place throughout Staffordshire using existing resources, giving training to older primary school pupils on cycling safely on short journeys such as to school. Annual campaigns to increase active travel are supported, include Walk to School, Be Bright Be Seen, Cycle and Scoot to school days, WoW (Walk once a Week). Modeshift STARS (Sustainable Travel Accreditation and Recognition for Schools) are also awarded to schools that demonstrate excellence in supporting sustainable travel. Further funding would provide the opportunity for these initiatives to be targeted more intensively along routes being enhanced by the LCWIP programme.

Project Management

Governance

9.10 The County Council has an excellent track record in delivering the types of measures proposed in the LCWIP programme. The LCWIP programme will be delivered using existing local delivery and governance arrangements. The production of the LCWIP and future reviews is the responsibility of Staffordshire County Council’s Assistant Director for the Connected and Sustainable County. The Assistant Director for Highways and Built Environment has overall responsibility for the management of the County Council’s strategic partnership with Amey who are contracted to deliver all highway improvements on the local highway network, together with top-up resources for infrastructure and environmental professional/consultancy services.

9.11 Staffordshire County Council’s Connectivity Strategy Team within Connectivity and Sustainability will work closely with the Amey’s principle engineers and their delivery teams to enable the LCWIP programme to be delivered within budgets and timescales, actively managing risks and seeking political approvals when appropriate. Amey engineers will plan and develop work programmes, manage staff and contractors and ensure delivery meets scheme objectives, using available resources.

Consultation Process

9.12 This draft version of Staffordshire County Council’s LCWIP has been approved by Staffordshire County Council’s Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport. The final version of the LCWIP will be amended as appropriate to include the outcome of further consultations with:

- County Councillors within the six urban areas
- Teams within Staffordshire County Council, including:
  - Infrastructure Development and Improvements: responsible for providing highway and transport responses to planning applications
Community Infrastructure: responsible for corresponding with local councillors and communities regarding local highway issues
Future Connectivity: responsible for walking and cycling education, training and promotion
Cultural, Rural and Safer Communities: responsible for the Rights of Way network
• Delivery teams within Amey: responsible for detailed design and delivery of maintenance and improvements schemes throughout Staffordshire
• District/Borough Council local planning authorities covering the six urban areas

9.13 Further consultation opportunities will arise as the priority routes become embedded in other policy documents such as the Integrated Transport Strategies and Local Plans and through the planning consent process when transport mitigation measures are negotiated with developers.

9.14 Further engagement will take place when schemes within the programme progress to key stages in the design and delivery process, as follows:

• Approval of the County Council’s forward capital programme
• Informal consultations with key stakeholders and local councillors during scheme feasibility and design
• Formal Traffic Regulation Order consultations

Monitoring and review

9.15 The final version of Staffordshire County Council’s LCWIP document will be published in 2020 once the consultation process is completed. The aim will then be to review the document every three years to reflect progress on Local Plan approvals, government bidding opportunities and the availability of resources to potentially extend the geographical coverage of the document to include smaller settlements and inter-urban routes within Staffordshire. The LCWIP programme will be regularly reviewed to reflect the County Council’s capital programme, which will be influenced by future funding opportunities.

9.16 As resources permit, walking and cycling counts will be installed at key locations on the prioritised network to enable before and after monitoring to take place. Accident data will continue to be monitored and locations will be identified where consistent accident patterns occur that involve pedestrians and cyclists that might be prevented through remedial engineering works. As necessary, the length of new cycle network delivered will be reported and feedback surveys will be completed following the delivery of major infrastructure investment.

9.17 The overall objective of the LCWIP is realising the benefits to be gained by achieving the government’s ambitions of Better Safety, Better Mobility and Better Streets. The County Council will have overall responsibility for making sure that this LCWIP helps to achieve these ambitions. Measures are already being put in place to ensure the benefits are realised, including a varied range of policy and physical measures, such as:
• Allocation of schemes in the 2020/21 capital programme
• Use of existing effective governance and delivery arrangements
• Use of Amey, already contracted to deliver the highway improvements
• Embedding schemes in other local policy documents
• Engagement of key stakeholders throughout the delivery process
• Where possible, complementary education, training and promotion delivered to encourage the use of new infrastructure
For more information please contact:

Connectivity Strategy
Connectivity and Sustainability
Staffordshire County Council
No. 1 Staffordshire Place
Stafford
ST16 2LP

Tel: 0300 111 8000
Email: transport.planning@staffordshire.gov.uk

If you would like this document in another language or format (e.g. large text), please contact us on 0300 111 8000 or email transport.planning@staffordshire.gov.uk