

Rating Level of Service Assessment (Table 10.10.2)	
Project Number	1604121
Scheme	CV - Hospital Falls Road
Location	Hospital Falls Road, Option 1 - B
Date	15/01/2022
Revision Number	01
Assessment by	John Collins
Checked by	Luke O'Leary



**Rating Level of Service (LOS)**

Key Requirement	Factor	Design Principle	Indicators	Critical	Existing Layout			Option 1		Option 2		Option 3		Option 4		
					1 (Red)	1 (Amber)	2 (Green)	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	Score	Comments	
Convenience	Continuity	Routes should be able to cycle and walk safely and navigate along different sections of the same route and between different sections of the same route.	1. Ability to park leave route safely and easily considering left and right turns	Cyclists can connect to other routes without dismounting	Cyclists can connect to other routes without dismounting	Cyclists have dedicated routes with minimal dismounting, with an intersection-free journey	1	No formal provision along Hospital Falls Road. Most likely at west end signalised junction with A10, to east	1	No further formal connections	1	No further formal connections	1	No further formal connections	1	No further formal connections
	Continuity and Wayfinding	Routes should be complete with no gaps in provision. End of route signs should not be located. Cyclists should be able to follow the route continuously. Cyclists should not be abandoned particularly at junctions where provision may be required to ensure safe crossing movements.	2. Provision for cyclists throughout the whole length of the route	Cyclists are not abandoned at points along the route with no provision for crossing movements between junctions, including through junctions.	The route is made abandoned at points along the route with no provision for crossing movements between junctions, including through junctions.	Cyclists are not abandoned at points along the route with no provision for crossing movements between junctions, including through junctions.	2	No formal facilities	2	Continuous route provided including over side roads	2	Continuous route provided including over side roads	2	Continuous route provided including over side roads	2	Continuous route provided including over side roads
Directness	Directness	Cycle networks should provide a mesh or grid of routes across the town or city. The density of the network is the density between the routes which make up the grid pattern. The absence of routes should be a network with a mesh width of 200m.	3. Density of routes based on mesh width (i.e. distance between primary and secondary routes within the network)	Routes contribute to a network density more than 250 cycles per km <sup>2</sup>	Routes contribute to a network density more than 250 cycles per km <sup>2</sup>	Routes contribute to a network density more than 250 cycles per km <sup>2</sup>	1	Hospital Falls Road forms part of Route 65	1	Hospital Falls Road forms part of Route 65	1	Hospital Falls Road forms part of Route 65	1	Hospital Falls Road forms part of Route 65	1	Hospital Falls Road forms part of Route 65
	Distance	Routes should follow the shortest option available and be as near to the theoretical distance as possible.	4. Deviation of route	Deviation factor against straight line is calculated by dividing the actual distance along the route by the straight line (theoretical) distance to provide an alternative.	Deviation factor against straight line is calculated by dividing the actual distance along the route by the straight line (theoretical) distance to provide an alternative.	Deviation factor against straight line is calculated by dividing the actual distance along the route by the straight line (theoretical) distance to provide an alternative.	2	Most direct route along catenary	2	Most direct route along catenary	2	Most direct route along catenary	2	Most direct route along catenary	2	Most direct route along catenary
Safety	Time: Frequency of major stops or give ways	The number of times a cyclist has to stop or stop right of way in a route should be minimised. This includes stopping and give ways at junctions or crossings, motorcycle barriers, pedestrian crossings or give ways	5. Stopping and give way frequency	The number of stops or give ways on the route is more than 4 per km	The number of stops or give ways on the route is more than 4 per km	The number of stops or give ways on the route is more than 4 per km	2	Limited stops or give ways along route due to cyclist given priority	2	Limited stops or give ways along route due to cyclist given priority	2	Limited stops or give ways along route due to cyclist given priority	2	Limited stops or give ways along route due to cyclist given priority	2	Limited stops or give ways along route due to cyclist given priority
	Time: Delay at junctions	The length of delay caused by not being able to bypass stop moving traffic	6. Delay at junctions	Delay for cyclists at all junctions is greater than for motor vehicles	Delay for cyclists at all junctions is similar to or less than for motor vehicles	Delay for cyclists at all junctions is similar to or less than for motor vehicles	1	Cyclists are with traffic	2	Bypasses of all side road junctions provided	2	Bypasses of all side road junctions provided	2	Bypasses of all side road junctions provided	2	Bypasses of all side road junctions provided
Safety	Time: Delay on links	The length of delay caused by not being able to bypass stop moving traffic	7. Ability to maintain own speed on links	Cyclists travel at speed of descent vehicles in a cycle (road)	Cyclists can usually pass slow traffic in a cycle (road)	Cyclists can usually pass slow traffic in a cycle (road)	1	Cyclists on street, therefore, are able to overtake with the adjacent moving line	1	Cyclists can easily leave the area of light segregation at junctions by passing a section without facilities	2	Providing facilities at 1.5m wide means cyclists are unable to overtake slower cyclists in front	2	Providing facilities at 1.5m wide means cyclists are unable to overtake slower cyclists in front	2	Providing facilities at 1.5m wide means cyclists are unable to overtake slower cyclists in front
	Gradients	Routes should avoid steep gradients where possible. 10% or greater gradients should be avoided. Gradients should be avoided where possible. Gradients should be avoided where possible. Gradients should be avoided where possible.	8. Gradient	Routes include gradients steeper than 10%	There are no gradients steeper than 10%	There are no gradients steeper than 10%	2	No gradient observed	2	No gradient observed	2	No gradient observed	2	No gradient observed	2	No gradient observed
Safety	Reduction in speed differential	Where cyclists and motor vehicles are sharing the carriageway, the difference in speed should be minimised. This includes the speed of motor vehicles so that they are not a shock to cyclists. This particularly applies at points where risk of collision is greater, such as at junctions.	9. Motor traffic speed on sections of shared carriageway	85th percentile < 37mph (60kph)	85th percentile < 37mph (60kph)	85th percentile < 37mph (60kph)	1	Speed limit < 30mph, 85th percentile < 37mph, WB 20 mph	1	Assumed similar 85th percentile speed - scored amber due to light segregation in comparison to linked facilities	2	Cyclists not sharing carriageway	2	Cyclists not sharing carriageway	2	Cyclists not sharing carriageway
	Avoid high motor vehicle volumes where cyclists are sharing the carriageway	Cyclists should not be required to share the carriageway with high volumes of motor vehicles. This particularly applies at points where risk of collision is greater, such as at junctions.	10. Motor traffic volume on sections of shared carriageway	< 1000 AADT, < 10% HOV > 30% HOV	< 1000 AADT, < 10% HOV > 30% HOV	< 1000 AADT, < 10% HOV > 30% HOV	2	EB - 427 AADT WB - 422 AADT	2	Assumed similar AADT figures	2	Cyclists not sharing carriageway	2	Cyclists not sharing carriageway	2	Cyclists not sharing carriageway
Safety	Risk of collision	Where speed differential and high motor vehicle flow cannot be reduced cyclists should be separated from traffic through physical barriers, raised kerbs and other physical measures. Such separation should reduce the risk of collision from head-on, side-swipe, rear-end and other collisions.	11. Separation to reduce risk of collision	Cyclists sharing carriageway with motor traffic	Cyclists are separated from motor traffic	Cyclists are separated from motor traffic	2	Topographical survey shows roughly 7.5m wide	2	Cyclists in light segregation and 85th percentile speed 30 mph	2	Cyclists in light segregation	2	Cyclists in light segregation	2	Cyclists in light segregation
	Avoid conflict	A high proportion of collisions involving cyclists occur at junctions. Junctions therefore need particular attention to reduce the risk of collision. Junction treatments include: - One-way roads - cycle priority - avoid speed reduction across side roads - Major roads - separation of cyclists from motor traffic through physical barriers	12. Junction treatments	Side road junctions are not separated from main road traffic	Side road junctions are separated from main road traffic	Side road junctions are separated from main road traffic	2	Frequent unseparated side road junctions along northern link	1	Cyclists have coloured markings continued over side roads	2	Continuous cycleway provided across side roads	2	Continuous cycleway provided across side roads	2	Continuous cycleway provided across side roads
Safety	Avoid conflict	Where speed differential and high motor vehicle flow cannot be reduced cyclists should be separated from traffic through physical barriers, raised kerbs and other physical measures. Such separation should reduce the risk of collision from head-on, side-swipe, rear-end and other collisions.	13. Road markings	Side road junctions are not separated from main road traffic	Side road junctions are separated from main road traffic	Side road junctions are separated from main road traffic	2	No road markings at side road junctions	1	New road markings showing priorities at side roads	2	New road markings showing priorities at side roads	2	New road markings showing priorities at side roads	2	New road markings showing priorities at side roads
	Consider and reduce risk from users of shared road spaces	Routes should be assessed in terms of the risk of collision with other users of the road space, including collision with pedestrians, bus stops, parking, including collision with stopped cars.	14. Conflict with vulnerable users	Significant risk of collision with vulnerable users	Significant risk of collision with vulnerable users	Significant risk of collision with vulnerable users	2	Nothing along northern link bus stop and no cycle provision therefore, zero score	2	Although provision less than 2m including buffer, kerbside parking removed entirely	2	Although provision less than 2m including buffer, kerbside parking removed entirely	2	Although provision less than 2m including buffer, kerbside parking removed entirely	2	Although provision less than 2m including buffer, kerbside parking removed entirely
Safety	Reduce severity of collisions	Where possible routes should include 'weave' routes (such as grass verges) and avoid any unnecessary physical hazards such as parked cars, etc., to reduce the severity of a collision should it occur.	15. Weave routes and unnecessary hazards	Cyclists at risk of physical impacts from parked cars and other hazards	The route includes physical hazards and avoids any physical impacts from parked cars and other hazards	The route includes physical hazards and avoids any physical impacts from parked cars and other hazards	1	Cyclists travelling along carriageway with vehicle	1	1.5m kerbed facility across northern link	1	1.5m Kerbed facility limits section cent to verge	1	1.5m Kerbed facility limits section cent to verge	1	1.5m Kerbed facility limits section cent to verge
	Baricade quality	Reinforcement or carriageway construction providing smooth and level surface	16. Surface type	Surface is not reinforced or level	Surface is reinforced or level	Surface is reinforced or level	2	Various patches of reinforced catenary	2	Various patches of reinforced catenary	2	Various patches of reinforced catenary	2	Various patches of reinforced catenary	2	Various patches of reinforced catenary
Safety	Effective width without conflict	Cyclists should be able to comfortably cycle without risk of conflict with other users both on and off road.	17. Effective width	Effective width is less than 1.5m	Effective width is 1.5m or more	Effective width is 1.5m or more	2	Cyclists on carriageway are with traffic, no segregation provided	2	Consistent 1.5m facility provided	2	Consistent 1.5m facility provided	2	Consistent 1.5m facility provided	2	Consistent 1.5m facility provided
	Wayfinding	Non-cyclist cyclists should be able to navigate the routes without the need for route signs.	18. Wayfinding	Signage is not provided or is not legible	Signage is provided and is legible	Signage is provided and is legible	1	Minimal signage provided	2	Minimal signage provided but clear road markings delineating route	2	Minimal signage provided but clear road markings delineating route	2	Minimal signage provided but clear road markings delineating route	2	Minimal signage provided but clear road markings delineating route
Safety	Social safety and perceived vulnerability of user	Routes should be appealing and be perceived as safe and usable. Well used routes are more attractive and therefore more likely to be used.	19. Social safety	Route is not perceived as safe	Route is perceived as safe	Route is perceived as safe	2	Lighting provided	2	Lighting provided	2	Lighting provided	2	Lighting provided	2	Lighting provided
	Impact on pedestrians	Inclusion of dedicated on-road cycle provision can create potential for conflict with pedestrians. Pedestrians should be able to safely use the route, particularly if the shared use path does not meet recommended criteria.	20. Impact on pedestrians	Route is not perceived as safe	Route is perceived as safe	Route is perceived as safe	1	Mixed use properties	1	Mixed use properties	1	Mixed use properties	1	Mixed use properties	1	Mixed use properties
Safety	Minimise street clutter	Signage required to support scheme layout	21. Signage	Signage is not provided or is not legible	Signage is provided and is legible	Signage is provided and is legible	2	Linked signs in surrounding area	2	Linked signs in surrounding area	2	Linked signs in surrounding area	2	Linked signs in surrounding area	2	Linked signs in surrounding area
	Secure cycle parking	Ease of access to secure cycle parking with businesses and on street	22. Cycle parking	No additional secure cycle parking provided or not enough to meet demand	Additional secure cycle parking provided or enough to meet demand	Additional secure cycle parking provided or enough to meet demand	2	Not relevant to scheme	2	Not relevant to scheme	2	Not relevant to scheme	2	Not relevant to scheme	2	Not relevant to scheme

Criteria	Max Score	Sub-criteria Existing	% score Existing	Sub-criteria Proposed	% score Proposed	Sub-criteria Proposed	% score Proposed	Sub-criteria Proposed	% score Proposed	Sub-criteria Proposed	% score Proposed
Confidence	6	4	33%	4	67%	4	67%	4	67%	4	67%
Directness	10	8	80%	8	80%	8	80%	8	80%	8	80%
Safety	16	6	38%	12	75%	15	94%	15	94%	15	94%
Comfort	8	4	50%	7	88%	7	88%	7	88%	7	88%
Attractiveness	10	8	80%	7	70%	7	70%	7	70%	7	70%