



CHIPPENHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN_

Chippenham Town Council

Pedestrian Access to Public Transport Appendix 23

February 2023



Report on defining standards for the access to, and infrastructure related with, public transport.

Written By: David Mott

Date: Wednesday, 28 June 2023

Revision: 2.8

Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Public Transport.....	4
3. Review of Existing Standards and Related Information.....	5
3.1. Frequency.....	5
3.2. Distance/Time to Bus Stop	6
3.3. Walkway Dimensions	7
3.3.1. Width.....	7
3.3.2. Height.....	8
3.4. Signage	8
3.5. Surface Quality.....	8
3.6. Safety	9
3.6.1. Traffic.....	9
3.6.2. Crossings.....	9
3.6.3. Feeling and Attractiveness.....	10
4. Proposed Standards.....	11
Bibliography	12
Annexe 1: Summary of Standards and Relevant Information.....	13

1. Introduction

The Transport Topic Group is part of the team that has been set up to produce the Chippenham Neighbourhood Plan. One of the policy topics being considered by some of the members of the topic group is:

“Pedestrian Access to public transport”.

As part of the preliminary investigations associated with this policy topic it is useful to define suitable standards for the access to, and infrastructure related with, public transport. This report summarises the relevant standards and policies in order to achieve a set of standards that can be used to review the existing provisions for access, and to define requirements for future developments.

This report consists of the following sections:

- “1: Introduction” - (this section) - which describes the scope, purpose, and contents of this document.
- “2: Public Transport” - which explains what this document means by “public transport”.
- “3: Review of Existing Standards and Related Information” - which is the major section of the document. It details the existing standards and information that we have discovered that are relevant to the topic.
- ”4. Proposed Standards” - Summarises the standards that we propose should apply to pedestrian access to public transport.

These sections are followed by:

- Bibliography: That lists the sources used.
- Annexe 1: Summary of Standards and Relevant Information: that is a copy of the spreadsheet used to extract information from the sources.

2. Public Transport

The Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026: Public Transport Strategy (Wiltshire Council, 2011) considers various forms of public transport services. These are:

- Bus services.
- Demand responsive transport.
- Community and voluntary transport.
- Rail.
- Taxis and private hire vehicles.
- Education, social care and health transport

When considering “pedestrian access to public transport” we may reasonably assume that some of these forms of public transport provide a “door-to-door” service and so do not require any specific pedestrian access. The two major exclusions to this are bus and rail services, which are both considered in this document.

3. Review of Existing Standards and Related Information

We have reviewed a wide range of existing standards and related information. The relevant information from these sources was extracted and summarised. The list of sources we consulted is given in the Bibliography. The summary of the existing standards and related information is shown in Annexe 1: Summary of Standards and Relevant Information. The individual subjects of interest are discussed in the following sub-sections.

3.1. Frequency

Relevant definitions and standards are given in:

- *Towards harmonised indicators on access to urban public transport* (Poelman, 2016) defines frequencies: “High = >10 per hour; Medium = 4-10 per hour; and Low = < 4 per hour”.
- *Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026: Public Transport Strategy* (Wiltshire Council, 2011) defines frequencies: “Proposed hierarchy of bus services:
 - Strategic Network Services:
 - Primary Strategic Network: Hourly service.
 - Secondary Strategic Network: Two hourly service.
 - Local Services - towns:
 - Primary Town Services: Hourly Service.
 - Secondary Town Services: 5 return trips per day.
 - Local Services - rural areas:
 - Services linking Local Service Centres: Three return journey opportunities per day, including for journey to work.
 - Services to other settlements: One return per day

Conclusion

The frequencies quoted in the EU paper (Poelman, 2016) are quite high for our purposes. They are probably more applicable for city services. For the purposes of the Chippenham Neighbourhood Plan we have decided to adopt a definition of frequency based on the Wiltshire Council definition but extended to reflect aspirations for a better service. Our definitions for access within the town are therefore:

- Good: Two or more per hour.
- Average: Hourly Service.
- Poor: 5 return trips per day
- Not Acceptable: Less than 5 return trips per day

3.2. Distance/Time to Bus Stop

Relevant definitions and standards are given in:

- *CIHT: Buses in Urban Developments* (Pharoah, 2018) states:
 - A 300-metre notional catchment will result in maximum walking distances up to around 400 metres.
 - Distances between bus stops will generally be in the range of 200-400 metres.
 - Stagecoach (2017) recommends a spacing of 280-320 metres in residential areas
 - Core bus corridors with two or more high-frequency services: max walking distance 500 metres
 - Single high-frequency routes (every 12 minutes or better): max walking distance 400 metres
 - Less frequent routes: max walking distance 300 metres
 - Town/city centres 250 metres
- *Towards harmonised indicators on access to urban public transport* (Poelman, 2016) recommends:
 - a maximum walking time of 5 minutes to a bus stop. (This is roughly equivalent to 400 metres.)
 - distance limit without a rest: Wheelchair users 150m; Visually impaired 150m; Mobility impaired using stick 50m; Mobility impaired without walking aid 100m.
- *Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026: Public Transport Strategy* (Wiltshire Council, 2011) recommends “Primary Town Services: urban population within 400m ...”.
- *Chippenham Transport Strategy DRAFT Strategy Refresh 2015* (Atkins Ltd, 2015) notes that “some parts of the ... site are more than 400 metres from existing stops ... etc.”, which infers that this report adopted the “400m standard”.
- *Planning Portal: Promoting Public Access* (UK Government, 2006) confirms that “Ideally, walking distances to bus stops should be shorter than that to the competing car park, and no more than 400 metres. Walking distances need to be much shorter for people with mobility impairments (e.g. sheltered housing)”

Conclusion

The generally accepted maximum distance to a bus stop in the Chippenham environment is 400m. It is noted that this should be “much less” (about 150m) for people with mobility impairments (e.g. in areas of sheltered housing) - although an alternative is to provide a bench suitable for a rest. For assessment purposes it is acceptable to use a 300m notional catchment from a bus route.

3.3. Walkway Dimensions

3.3.1. Width

Relevant definitions and standards are given in:

- *Design standards for width of footways were 1.8m in Highways Act, 1959, and 2.0m in Highways Act, 1980.*
- *Sustrans' Manifesto for UK Government (Sustrans, 2019) says "Pavements should be wide enough to accommodate double pushchairs and wheelchairs".*
- *Sustrans' "Paths for Everyone" review (Sustrans, 2018) confirms that paths should be "Wide enough to comfortably accommodate all users".*
- *CIHT: Buses in Urban Developments (Pharoah, 2018) states "The minimum footway width on bus routes recommended by CIHT is 2.5 metres".*
- *Making transport accessible for passengers and pedestrians (Department for Transport, 2005) recommends:*
 - Someone who does not use a walking aid can manage to walk along a passage way less than 700mm wide, but just using a walking stick requires greater width than this; a minimum of 750mm. A person who uses two sticks or crutches, or a walking frame needs a minimum of 900mm, a blind person using a long cane or with an assistance dog needs 1100mm. A visually impaired person who is being guided needs a width of 1200mm. A wheelchair user and an ambulant person side-by-side need 1500mm width.
 - A clear width of 2000mm allows two wheelchairs to pass one another comfortably. This should be regarded as the minimum under normal circumstances. Where this is not possible because of physical constraints 1500mm could be regarded as the minimum acceptable under most circumstances

Conclusion

For the purposes of the Chippenham Neighbourhood Plan we have decided that a pathway width of 2.5 metres is desirable, but this may be reduced to 2m if considered necessary. Pathways of such widths should display "No Cycling" signs.

3.3.2. Height

Relevant definitions and standards are given in *Making transport accessible for passengers and pedestrians* (Department for Transport, 2005), which recommends that “Unobstructed height above a pedestrian way is also important, especially for visually impaired people. Generally, this should be a minimum of 2300mm “

Conclusion

For the purposes of the Chippenham Neighbourhood Plan we have decided that a pathway needs an unobstructed height of 2.3m.

3.4. Signage

Relevant definitions and standards are given in:

- *Sustrans' "Paths for Everyone" review* (Sustrans, 2018), which proposes that paths should be “Signed clearly and consistently”
- *CIHT: Buses in Urban Developments* (Pharoah, 2018), which states that “Amongst the quality considerations are Legibility, if necessary with pedestrian-specific signing to the nearest bus stop”.

Conclusion

For the purposes of the Chippenham Neighbourhood Plan we have decided that appropriate legible signs showing the way to the bus stops and local items of interest could usefully be provided.

3.5. Surface Quality

Relevant definitions and standards are given in:

- *Sustrans' "Paths for Everyone" review* (Sustrans, 2018), which proposes that paths should be “Smooth, well maintained, and well drained”
- *CIHT: Buses in Urban Developments* (Pharoah, 2018), which states that “Amongst the quality considerations are step-free access throughout (including dropped kerbs or raised carriageways at junctions and pedestrian crossing places); Absence of obstructions (parked cars, bins, advertising ‘A’ boards, bollards, etc.); ...”.

Conclusion

For the purposes of the Chippenham Neighbourhood Plan we have decided that paths should be smooth, well drained, well maintained, step-free and unobstructed.

3.6. Safety

3.6.1. Traffic

Relevant definitions and standards are given in:

- *Sustrans' "Paths for Everyone" review* (Sustrans, 2018), which says “We want to create a safe and accessible traffic free Network”.
- *CIHT: Buses in Urban Developments* (Pharoah, 2018), which states that “Amongst the quality considerations are little exposure to vehicle traffic (volume, speed, composition, noise and air pollution); Safety and security, including oversight and good lighting”.

Conclusion

For the purposes of the Chippenham Neighbourhood Plan we have decided that paths should, where possible, avoid busy roads.

(note: By some definition a “footway” adjoins a public highway; on divergence the “footway” becomes defined as a “footpath”).

3.6.2. Crossings

Relevant definitions and standards are given in:

- *Sustrans' "Paths for Everyone" review* (Sustrans, 2018), which says “... busy roads can be crossed safely by all users.”
- *CIHT: Buses in Urban Developments* (Pharoah, 2018), which states that “Amongst the quality considerations are safe road crossing”.

Conclusion

For the purposes of the Chippenham Neighbourhood Plan we have decided that appropriate safe crossings must be provided so that roads can be crossed safely by all users.

3.6.3. Feeling and Attractiveness

Relevant definitions and standards are given in:

- *Sustrans' "Paths for Everyone" review* (Sustrans, 2018), which says:
 - paths “could be used by a sensible 12-year-old travelling alone.
 - A path “... feels a safe place to be.”
 - “... all users can access and travel along path”.
- *CIHT: Buses in Urban Developments* (Pharoah, 2018), which states:
 - “walking routes to and from bus stops should be designed for use by people of all abilities.”
 - “Amongst the quality considerations are light and shade, microclimate, shelter from wind and rain; visual interest from buildings and landscaping (e.g., trees, grassed areas)
 - “The addition of planted verges or swales can improve the pedestrian ... experience.

Conclusion

For the purposes of the Chippenham Neighbourhood Plan we have decided that pathways should be pleasant and simple to use.

4. Proposed Standards

We propose the following standards should be applied to all new developments. Where appropriate they should also be applied to existing areas.

- (a) Service Levels are defined as:
 - Good: Two or more buses per hour.
 - Average: Hourly Service.
 - Poor: 5 return trips per day
 - Not Acceptable: Less than 5 return trips per day
- (b) The maximum distance to a bus stop should be 400m. Where regular usage by people with mobility impairments may be anticipated this should be reduced to 150m. (Note that for assessment purposes it is acceptable to use a 300m notional catchment distance from a bus route.)
- (c) The minimum width of a footway on a bus route and all footpaths (not adjacent to roads) is 2.5m, footways reducing to 2.0m elsewhere. “No Cycling” signs should be provided for all minimum width pedestrian paths. There should be an unobstructed height of 2.3m.
- (d) Appropriate legible signs showing the way to the bus stops and local items of interest should be provided.
- (e) Paths must be smooth, well drained, well maintained, step-free and unobstructed.
- (f) Paths should, where possible, avoid busy roads.
- (g) Appropriate safe crossings must be provided so that all roads can be crossed safely by all users.
- (h) Paths should be pleasant and simple to use.

Bibliography

- Atkins Ltd. (2015, November 5). Chippenham Transport Strategy DRAFT Strategy Refresh 2015 . Atkins Ltd.
- Department for Transport. (2005, December 15). *Making transport accessible for passengers and pedestrians*. Retrieved from UK Government:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/inclusive-mobility>
- Pharoah, T. (2018, January). Buses in Urban Environments. London: The Chartered Institution of Highways & Transportation.
- Poelman, H. (2016, November). *UDN Brussels 2016*. Retrieved from European Commission. DG Regional and Urban Policy.:
https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/conferences/udn_brussels_2016/7.1%20Hugo%20Poelman%20Regio.pdf
- Sustrans. (2018, November). *Paths for Everyone*. Retrieved from Sustrans:
https://www.sustrans.org.uk/media/2804/paths_for_everyone_ncn_review_report_2018.pdf
- Sustrans. (2019). *Sustrans Manifesto for UK Government*. Retrieved from Sustrans:
<https://www.sustrans.org.uk/media/5211/sustransmanifestoukgovernment.pdf>
- UK Government. (2006, November 09). *Transport Assessment Stage 2*. Retrieved from Planning Portal:
https://www.planningni.gov.uk/de/index/policy/planning_statements_and_supplementary_planning_guidance/spg_other/transport/transport_preparing/transport_stage2/transport_public.htm
- Wiltshire Council. (2011, March). Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2016: Strategy.

