City of York Council
Cycling Scheme Evaluation Tool

1.   Foreword

There has been a desire to develop a 'cycling model' which would predict the anticipated increase in cyclists using a facility once built. Unfortunately, on investigation, and after discussions with other authorities and consultants, it has been concluded that there is no such model in existence, although there is wide recognition that one would be useful.

The first steps towards developing such a model was to identify those factors which encouraged, and conversely, discouraged people from cycling.

When installing new cycling facilities in York, and with thorough before and after monitoring, it may be possible in the future to use this to build up an evidence base which would then give sufficient confidence to prioritise cycling in certain circumstances and give an estimate for the anticipated increase in cyclists, although this is not possible at present.

An extensive list of proposed cycling infrastructure works and/or improvements within York has been identified. With limited time-scales and budgets, not all of these can be undertaken, and it was recognised that those that can be undertaken need to be justified and prioritised.

This Evaluation Tool has been designed as a simple means to make direct comparisons of the relative benefits of one cycling infrastructure scheme against those of another [Table 1]. The purpose of the Evaluation Tool is to assess each individual scheme on its own merits, give each a score, and then subsequently compare to other schemes in order to prioritise work programmes. In this way it is intended that a database of indices for schemes past and present could be established, against which future schemes can be assessed and compared.

Several example routes within the Cycling City Programme were used with the Tool in order to adjust the weightings accordingly and develop a Tool which reflected Transport Planners' collective judgement on scheme priorities. The relative scoring for three such recently completed schemes are shown in Table 2. Please note however that before and after monitoring data is not yet available for these schemes.

For all current and future infrastructure schemes, before and after monitoring of cyclist-usage must be undertaken so that accurate figures can be given regarding increases in the number of cyclists using a facility (see the example in Annex 3). In this way, it may then be possible in the near-future to cross reference the Evaluation Tool score with the cost of a facility in order to estimate anticipated use of a proposed facility and its value for money.

2.   Instructions

The Evaluation Tool is used by judging the proposed route/facility using a list of factors: encouragers/discouragers to cyclists, each of which is weighted due to their relative importance to cyclists.

Some heavily weighted factors have an option of scoring from 5 (maximum encourager) to –5 (maximum discourager) where the factor is an important one which greatly impacts on a facility.

With other less weighted factors the range is less broad (for example, from 3 to –2 etc) where a factor may impact slightly less on a cycle facility and is of less importance.

A scoring of 0 for a factor is appropriate when a facility would be neither better, nor worse than the status quo.

Once a score has been assigned to all factors, the total sum of these is the overall cycling-benefits score of the proposed scheme (out of a possible maximum score of 38) and can be measured against the scores of other schemes, past and present, in order to justify a scheme. In the case where several schemes need prioritising, the highest scoring of the schemes should be the highest priority, subject to Officer's discretion.

Table 1

ROUTE / SCHEME: _____

5	4	3	2	1	0	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5

	Encouragers				**Neutral**		**Discouragers**			

Score

#	Encourager	Score	Discourager
1	The route gives the cyclist an advantage over other traffic through "time saved"	5 ← 0 → -5	The route gives no advantage to the cyclist over other traffic and may lengthen their journey time
2	The route is direct with no deviations from the desire-line	4 ← 0 → -4	The route deviates largely from the desire-line with cyclists likely to use more direct highway routes
3	The route is a major commuter route and/or safer route to school, widely used	5 ← 0 → -3	The route is rarely used and / or is a leisure route
4	The route links a large number of residents with a 'destination'	4 ← 0 → -3	The route is isolated with no 'destination'
5	The new route vastly reduces the risk of accident to a cyclist, compared to previously	4 ← 0 → -3	The new route actually increases risk of accident compared with previously
6	"Quick Win" – relatively cheap to implement, with potentially a large impact	4 ← 0 → -2	Potentially lots of expensive utilities diversions expected
7	The route is continuous with no barriers, side-roads, cause for stopping etc	3 ← 0 → -3	The route requires the cyclist to stop and start several times due to side-roads, signals, barriers etc
8	The route has no danger from high speed / volume of traffic or potential conflicts with drivers	3 ← 0 → -3	The route incorporates sharing road-space with high speed / volume of traffic or more opportunities for conflicts
9	The route provides connectivity with other cycle routes or transport hubs	3 ← 0 → -2	The route is purely 'stand alone' / isolated
10	Popular scheme, with large public & Ward Member 'buy-in' / support	3 ← 0 → -2	No support for scheme from any areas / local objections

Total =

Table 2

Examples of the scoring of three recently completed Cycling City schemes when inserted into the Evaluation Tool:-

ROUTE / SCHEME: Moor Lane Bridge

Encourager / Discourager	Score	Reasoning
1	3	*Advantageous over slow/queuing traffic*
2	4	*Very direct*
3	5	*Heavily used route to College and P&R site*
4	4	*As above (and also links to Tesco store)*
5	2	*Still some aspect of risk when riding on-road*
6	-1	*Kerblines moved*
7	3	*Continuous throughout*
8	2	*Some minor associated danger with riding alongside traffic*
9	2	*Provides some connectivity*
10	2	*Fairly popular scheme*
SCORE	**26**	

ROUTE / SCHEME: Clifton Green

Encourager / Discourager	Score	Reasoning
1	4	*Advantageous over slow/queuing traffic*
2	4	*Very direct*
3	4	*Well used commuter route*
4	3	*On main commuter route to City Centre*
5	3	*Much reduced risk than previously*
6	-2	*Expensive scheme with a lot of diversions etc*
7	3	*Continuous throughout*
8	2	*Some minor associated danger with riding alongside traffic*
9	3	*Connects to many cycle and highway routes*
10	0	*Balance between positive and negative opinions expressed*
SCORE	**24**	

ROUTE / SCHEME: Beckfield Lane (Phase I)

Encourager / Discourager	Score	Reasoning
1	-2	*Cyclist somewhat disadvantaged at side-roads*
2	3	*Mostly on desire-line except some side-road crossings*
3	5	*Safer route to school*
4	3	*Links residential area to school(s)*
5	3	*Much reduced risk than previously as off-road*
6	0	*Some works associated*
7	-1	*Straight route, but a few side-road crossings*
8	1	*Minor conflicts at side-road crossings*
9	2	*Connects to some other routes*
10	2	*Support for safer route to school*
SCORE	**16**	