LRSSB - LRG - 19.0



Cycle Tramway Interface Guidance













LRSSB - LRG - 19.0		
lssue	1	
Revision	01	
Date	13/04/2023	
Page	1 of 14	

TITLE: CYCLE TRAMWAY INTERFACE GUIDANCE							
REF:	LRG	LRG 19.0		STATUS:		FINAL	
ISSUE:	01	REVISIO	N:	01	DATE:		13/04/2023
DEPT:	LRSS	LRSSB Safety Assurance			REVIEW DUE:		13/04/2028
DOCUMEN	TOWNE	ER:			DISTRIBU	DISTRIBUTION:	
LRSSB			ALL UK TRAMWAYS				
DESCRIPTI	ON:						
THIS DOCU CYCLES	MENT P	ROVIDES C	IUIDAN	ICE ON	THE INTERF	AC	E BETWEEN TRAMWAYS AND
EXPLANAT	ORY NO	DTE:					
subsequent Compliance	e appropriate to their operations. It is recommended that this process of evaluation and any nt decision to adopt (or not adopt) elements of this guidance should be documented. the with any or all of the contents herein, is entirely at an organisation's own discretion. / RELATED DOCUMENTS:						
LRG 1.0 Tram	way Princi Ince on Tra estrian Saf Regulation le Infrastru	ples and Guid amway Cross fety Guidanco as and Genera ucture Design	Jance (Ti ings for e (LRSSB al Directi n, July 20	Non-Mot 3) ions, 201	corised Users (6 (DfT etc)	LRS	SB)
RELATED	RAININ	G COURSE	S:		RELATED LEGISLATION:		
N/A				Railways and	Ot	ty at Work Act etc. 1974 her Guided Transport Systems (Safety) 16 (as amended) (ROGS) 2006	
CHANGE NOTES:							
Date of Issue	lssue No.	Revision No.	Reviev	wer	Details	of	Revision
13/04/2023	01	01	LRSSB		Amend	mer	nts to text / format

UNCONTROLLED WHEN PRINTED



LRSSB - LRG - 19.0		
lssue	1	
Revision	01	
Date	13/04/2023	
Page	2 of 14	

LRSSB

DOCUMENT CODE: LRG 19.0

CYCLE TRAMWAY INTERFACE GUIDANCE

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction
2.	Scope
3.	Design Principles
4.	Types of Interface
5.	Other Considerations

<u>Tables</u>

Table ATermsTable BAbbreviations

<u>Figures</u>

Figure 3.1	Cycle Let Up Example 1
Figure 3.2	Cycle Let Up Example 2
Figure 4.1	Tramway Crossing
Figure 4.2	Concept of Crossing Arrangements of Road /
	Cycle Track / Footway / Tram Track
Figure 4.3	Cycle Bypass at Tramstop
Figure 5.1	Cycle Skid Risk Signage
Figure 5.2	Tram Track Information Board



LRSSB - LRG - 19.0		
lssue	1	
Revision	01	
Date	13/04/2023	
Page	3 of 14	

Revisions from Previous Issue

New LRG document template and other formatting.

Figures and Tables listed in the Contents Page.

Changes to Page 1: removal of the named preparer, reviewer and authorising person and insertion of an explanatory note in relation to the status of this guidance document.

Additional abbreviations added to the Table A: Terms and Table B: Abbreviations (from existing text).

Additional text added to Introduction to be consistent with other LRG documents.

Scope notes the consideration of electric scooters.

Figure 3.2 added.

Text added to 5.7 relating to Road Safety Audits.

Numerous minor presentational, minor factual and typographical changes.

Text added to aid clarification where required / appropriate.



LRSSB - LRG - 19.0		
lssue	1	
Revision	01	
Date	13/04/2023	
Page	4 of 14	

TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Table A – Terms

Term	Definition
Cycleway Let Up	A design to provide a safe route for a cyclist to leave a section of highway shared with trams before, for example, a narrow section of road or tramstop.
Line of Sight	Operating mode where a tram should be able to stop before a reasonably visible stationary obstruction ahead, from the intended speed of operation using the service brake.
Transport and Works Act (TWA) Order (or Transport and Works (Scotland) Act (TAWS) Order)	Statutory process for attaining Powers to build operate and maintain a tramway / Light Rail system.

Table B – Abbreviations

Term	Definition	
DfT	Department for Transport	
LRSSB	Light Rail Safety and Standards Board	
LTN	Local Transport Note	
ROGS	Railways and Other Guided Transport Systems (Safety) Regulations 2006 (as amended)	
TAWS	Transport and Works (Scotland)	
TfWM	Transport for West Midlands	
TPG	Tramway Principles and Guidance	
TWA	Transport and Works Act	
UK	United Kingdom	



LRSSB - LRG - 19.0		
lssue	1	
Revision	01	
Date	13/04/2023	
Page	5 of 14	

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This guidance supports the high level principles set out in LRG 1.0 Tramway Principles and Guidance (TPG) published by the Light Rail Safety and Standards Board (LRSSB).
- 1.2. This document provides high level guidance in relation to the interface between cycles and the tramway for those delegated this responsibility in relation to UK tramways (Light Rail systems) based on 'line-of-sight' operations only. As with all guidance, this document is not prescriptive and is intended to give advice not to set a mandatory industry standard.
- 1.3. Much of this guidance is based on the experience gained from existing tramways and from published documents from other tramways worldwide. It does not prescribe particular arrangements adopted by any existing UK tramway, and is intended to give guidance and advice.
- 1.4. This guidance is not intended to be applied retrospectively to existing tramways. However, owners and operators should consider and assess any implementation of this guidance and / or any subsequent revision to ensure continual improvement in reducing risks, so far as is reasonably practicable, such as when undertaking track renewal schemes and when reviewing safety with Highway or Roads Authorities.



LRSSB - LRG - 19.0		
lssue	1	
Revision	01	
Date	13/04/2023	
Page	6 of 14	

2. Scope

- 2.1. Cycle usage is increasing in towns and cities as part of a move towards more active travel. It is therefore important that tramways are designed in such a way to safely integrate cycling for all ages and abilities as part of an holistic transport scheme promoted by the local transport authorities and central government policy.
- 2.2. When developing a new tramway scheme, reserving sufficient land to enable an optimised interface between cycles and tramways should be a significant factor in its design. Cycle provision along the tramway route should be considered during scheme development, and from early design of the tramway prior to any application for a Transport and Works Act (TWA) Order (or Transport and Works (Scotland) Act (TAWS) Order)¹. Any additional land and Powers required to safely accommodate cycles can then be sought within the TWA / TAWS Order.
- 2.3. When designing a tramway, cycles should be considered as non-motorised vehicles rather than pedestrians with a bike. Users of Electric scooters should also be considered.
- 2.4. Various guidance already exists both nationally and at regional transport level with regards to the design of cycle provision. General guidance on cycle issues is found in DfT Local Transport Note LTN 1/20: Cycle Infrastructure Design (July 2020)².
- 2.5. In addition, Transport for West Midlands (TfWM) has produced extensive guidance on cycling and its integration into the public realm: West Midlands Cycle Design Guidance 2019. Appendix C of TfWM's document is particularly relevant for tramways.³
- 2.6. The purpose of this LRSSB guidance document is to supplement existing guidance in respect of cycle interaction with the tramway, and it should be read in conjunction with the general guidance provided in LRG 1.0 TPG and LRG 2.0 Guidance on Tramway Crossings for Non-Motorised Users.

¹ The means by which statutory Powers to build, operate and maintain a tramway are provided. 2

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/ 951074/cycle-infrastructure-design-ltn-1-20.pdf

³ https://corporate.tfwm.org.uk/media/2713/2019-07-15-wm-guidance-wcovers.pdf



LRSSB - LRG - 19.0		
lssue	1	
Revision	01	
Date	13/04/2023	
Page	7 of 14	

3. Design Principles

- 3.1. Early tramway design should aim to segregate cycles from trams as far as practicable to minimise interfaces between tramways and cycles. Careful design is also required in the scenario where cycleways are added to an existing tramway system. Cycle routes can be achieved in a number of ways depending on space and Powers available.
- 3.2. Minimising the interaction between cycles and trams can be achieved through segregation of the tramway from the highway, or provision of segregated cycleways remote from the highway and tramway. However, cycle routes in whatever form should be as direct as possible and not take users on an indirect route that is likely to result in the facility not being used and cyclists potentially choosing to stay on the tramway and being exposed to the risk that the facility is trying to mitigate.
- 3.3. Early liaison with the relevant Highway or Roads Authority (or Authorities) is advised at the start of the development of any scheme to ensure that, where applicable, the individual Highway or Roads Authority specify any policies they may have and can provide any guidance or information, including any relevant stakeholder groups.
- 3.4. Local cycling and active travel groups may also provide useful information in relation to local cycle routes and relative demand. This may include finding the most practicable effective cycle route solutions for the tramway route under development.
- 3.5. A hierarchy of provision should be agreed with relevant stakeholders at an early stage in the design process. Such a hierarchy could include segregated cycleways, cycleways shared with pedestrians and shared carriageways etc.
- 3.6. Cycle measures should not be limited to just addressing problems associated with the interface between the tramway and cycling at a specific location. A holistic 'continuous route' approach should be taken to ensure that any cycling provision proposed integrates fully with new and existing cycling provision within the corridor as a whole, rather than a series of disjointed measures directly related to the tramway.
- 3.7. Cycle provision, including alternative routes, should follow the continuous route concept if practicable. With careful design of cycle infrastructure it is possible to create a route where the cyclist does not make a conscious decision to ignore designated cycle routes provided. Two examples of good practice solutions for a 'cycleway let up' are shown below in Figure 3.1 (Source: DfT Local Transport Note LTN 1/20: Cycle Infrastructure Design (July 2020)) and Figure 3.2 (Source: UK Tram).

Figure 3.1: Cycle Let Up Example 1



LRSSB - LRG - 19.0	
lssue	1
Revision	01
Date	13/04/2023
Page	8 of 14



Figure 3.2: Cycle Let Up Example 2



- 3.8. If cycles and trams have no option but to share the same highway alignment, then there should be appropriate facilities for cycles to make safe crossing movements across the rails and to traverse junctions, tramstops and pedestrians crossings.
- 3.9. Crossing points should have adequate visibility of approaching trams and be provided with signage, surface markings, crossing controls, lighting etc. as appropriate to the specific requirements of the location.
- 3.10. The minimum desirable crossing angle for a cycle over a track should be 60 degrees, as experience from tramway systems has shown that falls from cycles due to greasy rail head or being trapped in the groove significantly increase at lower angles. Refer to the next section for further information.
- 3.11. Any cycle route that is provided or actively promoted to avoid cycles crossing tram tracks at unacceptable angles should be intuitive. Ideally, it should not involve a significant



LRSSB - LRG - 19.0	
lssue	1
Revision	01
Date	13/04/2023
Page	9 of 14

increase in cycle journey time or any sudden turns or movements, and should require minimal sign posting. The use of complicated 'map' type signage should be avoided, and instead there should be a reliance on providing appropriate infrastructure to clearly denote the cycle route. The use of kerbing and coloured surfacing should be introduced to define a safe route.

- 3.12. Depending on visibility and speeds of approach on both the tramway and cycleway, it may be necessary to provide chicane barriers on the cycleway at the crossing point to slow cyclists and ensure that they turn to view approaching trams. See LRG 2.0 for further information.
- 3.13. There are a number of tramway systems around the world that have experimented with groove infills to prevent bicycle wheels becoming trapped. However, no proprietary system has yet been considered successful or safe for use on tramways.



LRSSB - LF	LRSSB - LRG - 19.0	
lssue	1	
Revision	01	
Date	13/04/2023	
Page	10 of 14	

4. Types of Interface

Track Crossing Points

- 4.1. Where it is necessary to provide a facility for cycles to cross tram tracks, intersections should be, as far as possible, at right angles to the tracks. Where there is no opportunity to provide a crossing angle that is greater than 60 degrees, alternative crossing layouts and other measures that mitigate the risks faced by cyclists when crossing at shallow angles should be considered to ensure the safety of cyclists.
- 4.2. If there is no reasonable design solution to avoiding crossing at shallow angles, consideration should be given to coloured lanes and / or patches providing sufficient contrast with surrounding paving to increase visibility in poor weather and poor light conditions, as illustrated in Figure 4.1 below (Source: West Midlands Cycle Design Guidance 2019 (TfWM)).

Figure 4.1: Tramway Crossing



Parallel Street Running

- 4.3. Where practicable, a cycle route adjacent to the tramway should be wholly outside of the tramway path with clear demarkation to guide cyclists from straying into the tramway path. Utilising DfT cycle design standards should provide a width that ensures cyclists keep within the cycle space provided and enable a tram to pass a cyclist within a safe distance.
- 4.4. In constrained environments where specific cycle provision cannot be accommodated (for example, city centres), the clearance between kerb and the nearest rail should be an absolute minimum of 1000 mm. Where practicable, any obstacles must be removed from that area, for example, using kerb drainage rather than in-carriageway drainage.
- 4.5. The above minimum clearance is intended to provide a clear route for cyclists and combined with the removal of obstacles from that area, to reduce the likelihood of sudden movements by cyclists towards the tramway. This minimum clearance distance is not intended to provide clearances for trams to pass cyclists.



LRSSB - LRG - 19.0	
lssue	1
Revision	01
Date	13/04/2023
Page	11 of 14

- 4.6. Additional provision may need to be made for cycles seeking to turn right when crossing in front or behind a tram, in order to provide a facility where they avoid crossing the tracks at shallow angles.
- 4.7. Whilst wider cycle lanes are beneficial, it should be noted that there is a risk that they could lead to unauthorised parking within the lane that obstructs the cycle provision, and may require a cyclist to cycle into the tramway, (as well as potentially obstructing the passage of a tram). To mitigate this, deterrent measures could be put in place in consultation with the Local Highway or Roads Authority, for example, through appropriate Traffic Regulation Orders. This is also something to consider when designing the scheme to ensure that appropriate Powers (and land) is sought within any TWA Order.

Good Practice Solutions

- 4.8. Good practice example solutions have been provided below for consideration by any designer for various common cycle / tramway interface scenarios.
- 4.9. Figure 4.2 below illustrates an arrangement where a safe cycle path is identified through the junction. In designing such an arrangement, consideration should be given to separate cycle traffic signals in preference to toucans if practicable (Source: West Midlands Cycle Design Guidance 2019 (TfWM)).

Figure 4.2 Concept of Crossing Arrangements of Road / Cycle Track / Footway / Tram Track



Tramstop Bypass Lanes

4.10. Tramstop bypass lanes can be considered. However, whilst the track interface is avoided by installing the bypass lane (for example, where there are side platforms), there needs to be appropriate mitigation of any potential safety risks associated with the additional pedestrian / cycle interface this may introduce. Therefore, this needs to be carefully considered by designers. Figure 4.3 below provides an illustration of such a facility (Source: West Midlands Cycle Design Guidance 2019 (TfWM)).



LRSSB - LF	LRSSB - LRG - 19.0	
lssue	1	
Revision	01	
Date	13/04/2023	
Page	12 of 14	

Figure 4.3 Cycle Bypass at Tramstop



- 4.11. All reasonable design effort should be given to providing a continuous cycle lane. Where there are discontinuities in cycle lanes due to the presence of tramstops, experience from tramways shows that there is likely to be misuse or misunderstanding by cyclists who following their desire lines even where this leads them to crossing rails at shallow angles.
- 4.12. Particular care should be taken to avoid pinch points in the cycle lanes.
- 4.13. On long, steep routes and on the approach to tramstops it is better to divert cyclists off the carriageway and give safe alternative provision.



LRSSB - LRG - 19.0	
lssue	1
Revision	01
Date	13/04/2023
Page	13 of 14

5. Other Considerations

- 5.1. The impact of rail head friction and skid resistance of sealants adjacent to the rail should be considered in order to reduce the chances of cycle wheels slipping on the rails.
- 5.2. Good quality lighting should be provided to allow the cycleways to be used by all users at all times of day and night.
- 5.3. Any cycle parking should be provided as close as possible to the tramstop platform as possible, with good lighting and passing surveillance. The cycle parking also needs to provide facilities for non-standard bikes (i.e. tricycles, bikes with panniers etc). Level access should be provided where possible.
- 5.4. The inclusion of a "cycle skid risk" sign should be considered along tramways as shown below in Figure 5.1. If not already obtained, authorisation for the use of such signage will need to be acquired, since this is not a sign prescribed in the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016⁴.

Slippery rails

Figure 5.1 – Cycle Skid Risk Signage

5.5. Some UK networks already use the above signage, however the accompanying information board can vary as shown in Figure 5.2 (below) to specify 'Tram Tracks'. If not already obtained, authorisation for the use of such signage will need to be acquired, since this is not a sign prescribed in the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016.

⁴

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/9 16837/TSRGD_2016_circular_document.pdf



LRSSB - LF	LRSSB - LRG - 19.0	
lssue	1	
Revision	01	
Date	13/04/2023	
Page	14 of 14	

Figure 5.2 – Tram Track Information Board



- 5.6. The approach to the design of cycle measures needs to be holistic. As stated above in Section 3, the Local Highway or Roads Authority may have policies, information and guidance to provide any promoter. In addition, local cycling groups may also provide useful information including potential user levels in addition to feedback on the most effective cycle route solutions for the tramway route under development.
- 5.7. A Road Safety Audit should be conducted when either a new tramway alignment is constructed or cycling provision is integrated with an existing tramway. The Road Safety Audit should be conducted in conjunction with the Local Highway or Roads Authority, taking into account the guidance published by National Highways for a Road Safety Audit GG119⁵ and / or equivalent local Highway or Roads Authority guidance. Although GG119 does not consider tramways, it is important that the scope for an audit takes into account the aspects to be considered for the safe operation of trams on the highway and is undertaken by auditors who are competent and have knowledge of tramways.

⁵ https://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/search/710d4c33-0032-4dfb-8303-17aff1ce804b