ERDF Low Carbon Travel and Transport Challenge Fund

ROUND 2
Last updated 24 October 2017

Paths – Guidance Note

Round 2 of the LCTT Challenge fund will consider path-only applications provided they can demonstrate that the path works are of sufficient scale and strategic importance, supporting everyday, functional trips.

1.   Background
Transport Scotland has committed to the delivery of up to 53km of associated path network with the ERDF 2014-2020 investment, augmenting work underway on the development of an effective, active travel network across Scotland.

At local level, this will see continuity of routes and linking of key destinations, encourage people to travel safely on foot or by bike within and between settlements and ensure that services, including public transport, as well as main trip attractors and generators are accessible by active travel means.

This guidance note is intended to provide supplementary information on 'paths' as they relate to the LCTT Challenge Fund, in conjunction with the summary provided in the Guidance for Applicants document. It clarifies the parameters of the available ERDF investment as this relates to support for 'paths' infrastructure, as well as clarifying the types of path envisaged and offering further links on standards and guidance that is available to potential applicants. Path-only applications will be considered provided they can demonstrate that the path works are of sufficient scale and strategic importance, supporting everyday, functional trips.

2.   What do we mean by 'paths' in the LCTT Challenge Fund context?
- a broad definition of 'path' or route is acceptable
- 'path' need not necessarily denote 'linear'; the proposal might support a broader idea of 'connectivity' through that path and the intervention proposed
- quality and impact of the intervention are paramount; contributing towards the delivery of the minimum national kilometre/ length targets is secondary.

3.   What will ERDF investment support?
- the ERDF investment can support proposals which will create new, open-up, upgrade or re-imagine paths which will increase active travel opportunities and public transport usage.
- the fund cannot support proposals for work which would be regarded to be within statutory responsibilities or general maintenance undertakings.
- construction of new path, upgrade to existing and bringing neglected path back into use

- proposals which make paths safer, more secure, more accessible, sustainable, visible and a more attractive, interesting option to improve connectivity across an area.
- the path might be physically connected to the proposed Hub/s or it may contribute to a wider package of 'behaviour change' measures being promoted via the Hub model
- Projects should build on key assets in an area by addressing any gaps in current active travel networks – for example, between key local community, employment, health or education services and venues.
- There is no minimum or maximum length set per LCTT Challenge Fund application.
- To address the ERDF LCTT programme commitment to delivering up to 53km, a case can be made, for example, that an intervention which will raise awareness and visibility of a hitherto ignored, neglected or underused path network, will also open up and increase numbers along a longer route.

4.   Current support for path networks

Applicants should ensure proposals are relevant to other paths work which may already be underway in an area. This ranges from capital infrastructure support, including Community Links, Community Links Plus and monies direct to local authorities through Cycling, Walking, Safer Streets (CWSS) budget for building of paths and cycle routes.

The majority of local authorities now publish active travel or cycling strategies, responding to the recommendation set out in the Cycling Action Plan for Scotland (CAPS). These prioritise infrastructure investment in support of the local active travel network.

And under Scottish access legislation, each access authority (local authority and national park authority) has a duty to draw up a plan of core paths in their area, after consulting with local communities, land managers and path users. Local path networks

There is also a wide range of relevant resource support available – via organisations such as Paths for All Paths for All community paths guidance and Sustrans Scotland Community Links

5.   Gaps in paths provision and opportunities for ERDF investment?

A discussion with active travel stakeholders identified the following areas for consideration;

- Potential to raise profile and complement active travel routes to school, wider educational facilities and specific services.
- 'Asset based' active travel networks – paths building on the 'assets' within an area – eg. improving town centre connectivity
- A package of minor paths contributing to the larger scale active travel networks

- Rural circumstances – where roads may be too narrow to allow for safe active travel opportunities and alternative routes can be encouraged
- Extreme 'urban' areas – very complex and difficult to initiate change
- Role for improved mapping & signage in opening up connectivity and supporting good quality experiences, including with public transport

6.   Standards?

Applicants are asked to set out their proposal, their rationale and the standards that they would follow to ensure sustainability of the path.

- There will not be a set of ERDF technical 'standards', benchmarks or minimum standards.
- 'Acceptable' and 'adequate' standards will be determined by the proposed route; dependent on envisaged mode and levels of usage as well as impact on the area in question.
- The path being proposed should however adhere to wider place-making principles.
- For example, a case might be made with reference to general place- making principles as set out in;
- *Designing Streets* 6 qualities of successful place: *key considerations for street designs.* Distinctive / Safe & Pleasant / Easy to move around / Welcoming / Adaptable / Resource efficient. *Designing Streets*
- Or responding to the relevant, practical questions raised by the **Place Standard – ** determining the strengths and assets of a place, identifying paths and areas where action might be taken to improve active travel and public transport links. Place Standard
- A case could be made that relevant standards are being set by any of; Cycling by Design Cycling by Design (trunk road focus), Cycle Friendly Design (Sustrans) Handbook , National Roads Development Guide National Roads Development Guide (SCOTS, 2014), and Paths Guide Lowland Paths Guide (Paths for All).

7.   Maintenance responsibilities?
Responsibility for maintenance can be a patchwork of public sector bodies, private and commercial landowners. Applicants would be asked to identify where responsibility would lie in their proposals.

8.   Need for Baseline Evidence – Monitoring and Evaluation
As for hubs, there will be a requirement to set in place a monitoring and evaluation framework relating to the paths element of an ERDF supported project. As with any intervention, it is important to monitor the levels of usage from initial stages of a project.

Again, there are a range of advice and measures already developed to support this – for example;

- Living Streets - Community Street Audits have already been undertaken in a number of areas and there are plans to undertake School Route Audits (planned) as well as Station Travel Plans (Johnston & Motherwell have been pilot cases). Living Streets also make pedestrian counter equipment available to borrow.
- Cycling Scotland have been developing a Cycling Potential tool – and this will be available to help establish baseline evidence Cycle Potential Tool

8. LCTT Challenge Fund Application tips

Path-only applications will be considered provided they can demonstrate that the path works are of sufficient scale and strategic importance, supporting everyday, functional trips
- The paths project will be assessed using the same criteria as for the Hubs project.
- Does this proposal contribute to measures set out in an Active Travel Strategy?
- Or feature in other place-based plans – *eg*. LDPs, Town Centre Action Plans,
- Does the proposal allow for cross-modal opportunities?
- details of current usage and anticipated uplift?
- How does the path proposal contribute to connectivity and wider place-making principles?