Planning for bicycles and other non motorised modes: The critical element in city transport system

Geetam Tiwari

Transportation Research and Injury Prevention programme (TRIPP)

Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi 110016, India

INTRODUCTION

A well functioning road infrastructure must fulfill the requirements of all road users. In the context of the present socio-economic realities of most developing countries, pedestrians, bicyclists and other slow moving vehicles cannot be eliminated from the urban landscape. Pedestrians, bicyclists and non-motorised rickshaws are the most critical elements in mixed traffic. If the infrastructure design does not meet the requirements of these elements all modes of transport operate in sub-optimal conditions. The needs of pedestrians and slow moving vehicles like bicycles and rickshaws have been ignored in the conventional planning strategies. These have been assigned lower importance compared to other vehicles present on the road, however, the experience from environments where 'captive pedestrians and bicyclists' are present makes a very strong case for rethinking conventional hierarchy of road users. It is clear that the present investment patterns focussed at improving conditions for cars is not leading to desired results. Congestion continues to worsen along with shift away from walking, bicycles and public transport- the desirable modes from environment sustainability perspective. Reversal of this trend is possible. It is possible to create pedestrian, bicycle and public transport friendly urban roads without increasing the right of way of existing arterial roads in most cities. The guiding principle of such a design is meeting the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists and public transport commuters in that order. This benefits all road users including motorized transport. However, if the roads are designed only for motorized traffic (personal cars), all road users including cars are forced to operate under sub-optimal conditions. This paper uses Delhi, India as a case study city to illustrate the need and guidelins for palnning an efficient urban road.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Bus commuters and pedestrians and non motorized vehicle (NMV) users together form the largest group of road users in many Indian cities. Yet their needs for a safe and convenient infrastructure continues to be ignored. In the name of development cities continue to invest in infrastructure which makes the environment for pedestrian even more hostile than the present. At the bus shelters, NMV's using the carriageway are in direct conflict with buses and the approaching commuters. In Delhi, buses park in platoons of 3 to 6 at an interval of 30 to 60 seconds. Thus for the cyclists, every bus shelter encountered, results in an increase in travel time and in the number of serious conflicts. To avoid an impending conflict at the bus shelter cyclists, either wait for the buses to clear their path or attempt to find their way slowly through a maze of buses and commuters. At many locations the passenger cycle rickshaw is one of the most important components of the commuting chain. The rickshaws ferry, passengers to and from the bus shelter, saving their walking trips. Currently the contribution of the passenger cycle rickshaw to the transportation system of the city is not recognized and thus no provision has been made for their parking at the bus shelters, forcing them to occupy the carriageway.

RICKSHAS AND NON-MOTORISED VEHICLES

Cycle rickshas are registered separately from motorised vehicles. Current policies regarding cycle rickshas and other non-motorised vehicles are restrictive based on a notion held by many that efficient ("modern") transport systems do not include these vehicles. Traffic management experts and traffic police have proposed area and time restrictions on the movement of cycle rickshas in Delhi. The government fixes the number of cycle rickshas that can be registered in the city (by Municipal Corporation of Delhi) and at present this is 99,000. The registration procedure requires the owner to have a valid registration card, and to register these vehicles only during stipulated times twice a year. Not surprisingly, a large number of cycle rickshas are unregistered. The true number of cycle rickshas in the city is estimated to be about 300,000. Cycle rickshas are also used for delivery of goods such as furniture, refrigerators, and washing machines. Several case studies have documented the poor, often exploitative, working conditions of cycle ricksha operators. Contractors who demand a fixed rental payment from the pullers, often with little regard to the state of the equipment or the environment in which the ricksha puller has to operate usually owns the vehicles.

Even though rickshas and other non-motorised vehicles are widely viewed as a principal cause of congestion and chaos, they have been ignored in traffic planning and road design.

INADEQUATE ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE?

Delhi has an extensive road network with a total length of 26, 582 km (year 1996-97) of which approximately 1148 km has a right-of-way 30m and greater than 30m. Nearly 500 km of these roads already exist, remaining 852 km is proposed in new developments. Ring road and Outer Ring road are the most important arterial roads. In general, most arterial roads are six lanes divided roads. Average speeds have been reducing over the years. Peak hour traffic on arterial roads crawls through bottlenecks at major intersections. However, at non-peak hour mid block speeds tend to be much higher ranging from 50-90 km/h for buses and private motorised vehicles respectively. This leads to higher fatality rates on one hand and on the other longer waiting periods at junctions. It seems that problem lies with the poor management of the corridor traffic flow and speed resulting in increased levels of congestion are at few spots and few corridors at peak hours. The traffic system does not meet the requirements of pedestrians, bicyclists and bus systems.

The existing road design does not cater to the needs of pedestrians, bicycles, or any other slow moving traffic. Service roads if present, are not maintained well. Footpaths are either not present or poorly maintained. There are no specific facilities provided for buses also, except locating bus shelters. Approach to bus shelters, bus priority lanes, continuous pedestrian paths, lane for slow vehicles like bicycles and rickshaws etc. have not been included in the road network designs. Consequently all road users have to share the carriageway. This often leads to unsafe conditions for pedestrian and slow moving vehicles and congested conditions for motorised vehicles. The per capita availability of road in Delhi in 1997 was 2.6 meters per person. It must also be noted that almost 66% of the vehicular fleet in Delhi consists of motorised two wheelers which take up less road space than cars and buses. Despite this, average speeds have been reducing over the years. Peak hour traffic on arterial roads crawls through bottlenecks at major intersections. In general, most arterial roads are six lanes divided roads; however, the extensive road network has not been developed to serve the mixed traffic present on the roads.

Presence of diverse socio-economic groups in the city is reflected in the diverse modes of transport present on all roads. This also results in emergence of range of activities required by different road users. The society pays a huge cost in terms of worsening congestion, air pollution and traffic accidents. While the growing congestion and air pollution affect all income groups, the middle and lower income groups who are primarily dependent on public transport, bicycles and walking -the environment friendly modes have to suffer the unusually high cost of traffic accidents. Commuting patterns of low income and high-income people residing in Delhi are significantly different. Since nearly 50-60% of the city population resides in unauthorised slum settlements having an average income of Rs.2000/month, bicycles, buses and walking continue to be important modes of transport.

Roadside vendors and services for road users

Bicycles, pedestrians and bus traffic attracts street vendors. Often the side roads and pedestrian paths are occupied by people selling food, drinks and other articles, which are demanded by these road users. Vendors often locate themselves at places, which are natural markets for them. A careful analysis of location of vendors, number of vendors at each location and type of services provided them shows the need of that environment, since they work under completely “free market” principles. If the services provided them were not required at those locations, then they would have no incentive to continue staying there. However, road authorities and city authorities view their existence illegal. Often the argument is given how the presence of street vendors and hawkers reduces road capacity. If we apply the same principle that is applied for the design of road environment for motorized traffic especially private cars, then vendors have a valid and legal place in the road environment. Highway design manuals recommends frequency and design of service area for motorized vehicles. Street vendors and hawkers serve the same function for pedestrians, bicyclists and bus users. As long as our urban roads are used by these modes, street vendors will remain inevitable and necessary. All modes of transport move in sub-optimal conditions in the absence of facilities for pedestrians and non-motorized vehicles.

THE 'CRITICAL' ELEMENT IN CITY TRANSPORT SYSTEM

Meeting the specific needs of the most vulnerable groups in the city becomes crucial for the efficient performance of all traffic. For low income people commuting to work- walking, bicycling or affordable public transport are not a matter of choice but a necessity for survival. Therefore, whether the roads have any specific facilities for these modes or not, they continue to be used by them.

Delhi traffic laws do not segregate bicycle traffic and enforcement of speed limits is minimal. Motor Vehicles (MVs) and non-motorised vehicle (NMVs) have different densities at peak traffic hours at different locations in the city. The existing traffic characteristics, modal mix, location details, geometric design, landuse characteristics, and other operating characteristics present a unique situation where economic and travel demand compulsions have overwhelmed the official plans. On the two and three lane roads, bicycles primarily use the outermost lane on the left, i.e. curb side lane and MVs do not use the left most lanes even at low bicycle densities. Bicyclists use the middle lanes only when they have to turn right. Even at one-lane sites the bicyclists occupy the left extreme giving space to the motorised vehicular traffic.

Though de facto segregation takes place on two and three lane roads, an unacceptable danger exists to bicyclists because of impact with MVs. At two- and three-lane locations, it is a waste of resources not to provide a separate bicycle lane because bicycles irrespective of bicycle density occupy one whole MV lane.Our data show that bicycle fatalities on two and three lane roads are relatively high when traffic volumes are low but conflicts between MVs and NMVs have little correlation whatsoever with fatalities during peak flows. In these locations of "integrated" traffic on two and three lane roads, fatalities during peak hours are low but not eliminated. On the other hand, during non-peak hours vehicles travelling at speeds around 50 km/h or greater kill a large number of bicyclists.(Tiwari G, D. Mohan, J.Fazio, 1998). Since bicycles and other non-motorized vehicles use the left side of the road, buses are unable to use the designated bus lanes and are forced to stop in the middle lane at bus stops. This disrupts the smooth flow of traffic in all lanes and makes bicycling more hazardous. Motorized traffic does not use the curbside lane even when bicycle densities are low. Providing a separate bicycle track would make more space available for motorized modes and bicycling less hazardous.

ROAD SECTON PLANNING FOR EXCLUSIVE NMV LANE and BUS LANE

Our studies show that on urban arterials the curbside lane (3.5 m) is used primarily by bicycle and other non motorized traffic. Because of the presence of bicycles and NMVs in the far-left lane, buses are unable to use this lane and are forced to stop in the middle lane at bus stops. Motorized traffic does not use the curbside lane even when bicycle/NMV densities are low. A segregated bicycle lane needs only 2.5 m and since most of the major arterials in Delhi as well other Indian cities where planned development has taken place after 1960s, have a service road, the existing road space is wide enough to accommodate a bicycle track. This would not require additional right of way for road. A detailed study completed in Delhi, India shows how existing roads can be redesigned within the given right of way to provide for an exclusive lane for NMT modes (bicycles and three wheeled rickshaws).[i]

Detailed designs for road cross section and intersections have been prepared in Delhi on the basis of following criteria:

Physically segregated bicycle tracks on routes which have >30m ROW.
Recommended lane width on main carriageway 3m (minimum).
Recommended lane width for buses 3.3 m (minimum).
Recommended lane width for bicycles 2.5 m (minimum).
Separate service lane and footpath.
Intersection modification to include the following:

- Restrict free left turns
- Modify traffic signal cycle
- Roadside furniture to ensure safe bicycle movement and minimise interference from motorised two wheelers

Exclusive bus lanes can be provided either as curbside bus lane (Figure1) or central two lanes physically segregated from rest of the traffic (Figure2). Table 1 lists criteria that should be adopted for choosing one of the two options. Figure 1 and 2 show detailed designs where two lanes of 3m each are proposed for the main carriageway in addition to the 3.3m wide central/curbside bus-lane. In the case of the central bus lane stretches the two 3.3m wide lanes combine to form a 6.6m wide undivided two way road. A 2.5 m wide cycle track is proposed throughout the length of the corridor running adjacent to the main carriageway (separated by a 0.4m wide divider on either side) A service lane is proposed between the cycle track and the peripheral footpaths all along the stretch with a minimum specified width of 3m.

The flow, speed and direction of traffic is controlled by the design of the junctions and road surfaces. The design, of course, differs completely in the case of Curbside bus Lane and Central Bus Lanes options.

Table1. Criteria for site specific choice between a central bus-lane layout and a curb-side bus-lane layout

Sl. No.	Central Bus Lane	Curb-Side Bus Lane
1.	**Excessive side-entries for vehicles into service lanes or individual plots.**	**Limited access to service lanes or widely spaced entry points into adjoining area.**
Rationale	The high volume of turning traffic interferes with the through movement of bus traffic if the bus uses the same curb-side lane as the turning vehicles.	
2.	**Closely placed traffic lights for vehicles.**	**Traffic lights at larger intervals.**

Rationale	Buses using the curb-side lane are forced to stop at every red signal with other vehicles reducing throughput and encouraging passengers to board and alight in unsafe areas.	
3.	**Low frequency of bus-stops**	**Higher Frequency of bus-stops**
Rationale	If the frequency of bus-stops is higher a central bus-lane will create too many pedestrian crossings defeating the its purpose while a curb-side bus lane will provide safer and more efficient bus-stops.	
4.	**Higher volume of two-wheeler and three-wheeler vehicles**	**Lower volume of two-wheeler and three-wheeler vehicles**
Rationale	High volumes of two-wheeler and three-wheeler vehicles interfere with the movement of buses in the curb-side lane especially at the bus-stops where buses often cannot approach the designated bus-bays due to the three-wheelers parked there and the two-wheelers trying to overtake from the left-side. Also, the difference in sizes of these vehicles sharing the curb-side lane makes the situation unsafe for the smaller vehicles.	
Eg.	**Arterials through heavy commercial landuse areas like Vikas Marg**	**Highways through large institutional areas like stretch of Ring Road in ITO area.**

Intersection with Curb-side Bus Lane:

- An extra bay is provided for right turning traffic at junction.
- The bus lane before and after the junction are streamlined.

The Minimum left turning radius according to which the curve of the intersection is plotted is (a) In case of buses not turning left : 7.5m with a sloped leeway of 1.5m for larger vehicles, (b) In case of buses turning left : 14m. with a sloped leeway of 1.5m. This case specific designing allows for control of left-turning speeds thus ensuring safety and the speed transition between an arterial and residential road.

Intersection with Central Bus Lane :

Three lanes - straight, left-turning and right-turning are provided for the vehicles before the intersection and only one after it due to dispersal of traffic. However the single lane after the intersection is 4.5m. wide to allow for necessary leeway. The central bus stretch becomes 3-lane wide before the junction to allow for a left-turning lane.

The bus lane before and after the junction are streamlined.

The Minimum left turning radius according to which the curve of the intersection is plotted is 7.5m with a sloped leeway of 1.5m for larger vehicles. This case specific designing allows for control of left-turning speeds thus ensuring safety and the speed transition between an arterial and residential road.

Bus stops have 2.8 m wide bus bay, 2.5 m wide bus stop and 1 m wide foot path. Hawkers have been provided space at the bus stop to minimize disturbance to the regular flow of pedestrian and cyclist traffic.

The cycle track is diverted behind the bus stop in a gentle horizontal curve to reduce conflicts of cyclists with buses. This diverted path is raised to the footpath level and can be used by pedestrians too hence is widened from 2.5 m to 3 m.

CAPACITY ESTIMATES:

If a separate segregated lane is constructed for bicycles, the curbside lane, which is currently used by bicyclists will become available to motorised traffic. This relatively small investment in bicycle lanes can increase the road space for motorised traffic by 50 percent on 3 lane roads. Bicycle lanes also result in better space utilisation. For instance a 3.5m lane has a carrying capacity of 1,800 cars per hour whereas it can carry 5,400 bicycles per hour[ii]. Average occupancy of a car is 1.15 persons [iii]and bicycle carries one person. This implies that in order to move the same number of people we would need 2.6 times the road area that would be required for bicyclists. Given the fact that there is not much space available to expand existing roads, the future mobility needs and projected trips can only be met by increasing the capacity of the existing road network. This can only be achieved by encouraging modes, which are more efficient in terms of space utilisation.

Most of the major corridors in Delhi are 6 lane divided carriageways. We have estimated the capacity of a 6 lane divided carriageway in the peak direction. Various combinations of modal shares and road space assignments were compared to evaluate their impact on the road capacity. Following options were considered.

Base case(Mixed traffic). The existing road space utilization pattern was taken as the base case. Capacity of a typical 6-lane corridor in Delhi corridor in persons per hour is estimated on the basis of average occupancy of each vehicle (Table2).

Dedicated cycle lane. The right-of-way on a 6-lane carriageway is reallocated to provide for a separate 2.5-3 m wide bicycle track. The exclusive bicycle track can carry 4500 bicycles per hour. This still leaves enough space for six lanes on the main carriageway. All the lanes of the main carriageway are used by all motorised modes. If the space released by exclusive bicycle track (equivalent of 338 bicycles ~ 169 PCU~76 buses as per Table2) is used by additional 76 buses the congestion level and corridor speed will not have significant changes. Table 2 shows increase in corridor capacity from 16000 to 19000. Number of bicycles and other vehicles remain same as the base case. Buses increase by 76 additional vehicles.

Dedicated bicycle lane and high capacity bus system (HCBS). A dedicated lane is provided for bicycles and the curbside lane is exclusively reserved for buses operating as HCBS. Other two lanes are used by all other motorized traffic. A dedicated 3 m wide bicycle lane can carry 4500 bicycles (maximum capacity of an urban lane is 1800 PCU ~ 4500 bicycles). Exclusive bicycle lane releases space on left most lane for buses. Therefore the maximum capacity of the left most lane is 1800 PCU ~ 486 buses (Table2).

The results of the capacity estimation show that with the corridor capacity measured in terms of persons/ hour in existing patterns of mixed traffic, capacity can be improved by 19% by providing exclusive bicycle tracks. If the bus occupancy is taken as 80 persons/bus then 23% improvement in capacity can be realised by providing exclusive bicycle tracks. Not only does extra space on the main carriageway become available to other modes, the dedicated bicycle track also provides a higher capacity for bicyclists. Provision of exclusive bicycle track also provides an opportunity to develop left lane as an exclusive bus lane. Table 3 shows 88% improvement in capacity from

16000(40 persons/bus) and 26000(80 persons/bus) to 30000 persons and 49000 persons respectively. This is achieved by running 486 buses in the exclusive bus lane and 4500 cycles in the exclusive cycle lane.

Table 3 shows capacity of the main carriageway(three lanes used by motorised vehicles). This does not include capacity provided by the cycle track. Corridor capacity improves by 19-23% by providing exclusive cycle track. However, utilizing the full capacity of the corridor i.e. provision of high capacity bus system in the left most lane can lead to capacity improvement by 56-73%.

It is clear that, if Delhi and other similar cities can have major improvement in public transport capacity if facilities for non-motorized transport are considered as an integral part of a programme to enhance road capacity. Not only are lanes designed for bicycle traffic less expensive to build than roadways, but they also will divert pedestrians and slow-moving vehicles from the roadway, increasing the efficiency of car and bus transport.

Table2: Capacity Estimation in different scenario

Current				**Exclusive Cycle track provided**		**Cycle track and HCBS**			
Vehicles/h		**Persons/h**			**Persons/h**	**Persons/h**		**Persons/h**	**Persons/h**
		Bus=40	**bus=80**	**Veh./h**	**bus=40**	**Bus=80**	**Veh./h**	**bus=40**	**bus=80**
Cars	1404	1614.6	1614.6	1404	1614.6	1614.6	1404	1614.6	1614.6
MTW	1652	3634.4	3634.4	1652	3634.4	3634.4	1652	3634.4	3634.4
BUS	248	9920	19840	324	12960	25920	486	19440	38880
TSR	454	799.04	799.04	454	799.04	799.04	454	799.04	799.04
Cycle	338	354.9	354.9	338	354.9	354.9	4500	4725	4725
Total	4096	16322.94	26242.94	4172	19362.94	32322.94	8496	30213.04	49653.04
	~	**16000**	**26000**		**19000**	**32000**		**30000**	**49000**

1 Current mixed traffic is observed modal shares on Delhi streets.

2 Cycle track provided scenario includes exclusive cycle track for bicycles where max. 4500 bicycles can travel.
Space occupied by 338 bicycles in the mixed scenario becomes available for other vehicles. This is equialent to 338x1/2 = 169 cars = 169/2.2 = 76.8 buses. Since bicycles share the left Side lane with buses, therefore bicycle space is given to 76 additional buses.
However, the maximum capacity of this lane as per IRC standard is 1800 PCU or 1800/3.7= 486 buses. If we replace 338 bicycles with additional 76 buses then the existing level of congestion and speeds will be maintained.

3 Cycle track filled to capacity ~ 4500 bicycles,and left lane filled to capacity by buses ~ 486 buses

Along with existing number of vehicles on the road gives the total capacity of the corridor.

Table3: Capacity in persons/h in three MV lanes(excluding bicycles)

	Bus=40		**Bus=80**	
	ExclusiveCycle Track	**Exclusive cycle track and HCBS**	**ExclusiveCycle Track**	**Exclusive cycle track and HCBS**
Car	1614.6	1614.6	1614.6	1614.6
MTW	3634.4	3634.4	3634.4	3634.4
Bus	12960	25920	19440	38880
TSR	799.04	799.04	799.04	799.04
Total	19008.04	31968.04	25488.04	44928.04
~	**19000**	**32000**	**25000**	**45000**

ESTIMATED MODAL SHIFTS AFTER INVESTMENT IN PUBLIC TRANSPORT/NMV FRIENDLY INFRASTRUCTURE

If public transport/NMV friendly infrastructure is developed in the city, following change may occur in the use of different vehicle use.

1. Short bus trips (1-6 kms) these will be primarily younger age group (15-24years) will include school trips and leisure trips of children and young adults. Short bus trips of working adults (24-60 years) can also be targeted for substitution. Shift from bus trips will generate capacity in the present overloaded bus system. It may not reduce demand for number of buses, in fact comfortable conditions in buses may make public transport attractive to two wheeler riders and few long trips(16-25kms) of two wheelers may move to buses. Therefore this will result in higher share of bicycle trips(from 2.75% to 5%), reduced share of motorised two wheeler trips(from 29% to 25%)and marginally higher share of bus trips(36% to 37%) .

2. Short car trips (1-6)kms of children and adults can also be targeted as in 1. If 1/3 of short car trips are replaced by bicycles, there will be an increase of 1.68% bicycle trips, i.e from 5% to 6.68%., car trips will reduce to 26.6%.

3. Short motorised two wheeler trips say 1/3 of short trips (1-6kms) will shift to bicycles increasing bicycle share by 2.5% from 6.68% to 9.18%. Motorised two wheeler trips will reduce to 22.5%.

4. Pedestrian trips more than 1km in length of all age groups and all income groups. This will result in marginal increase of bicycle trips because majority of the pedestrian trips are less than 1 kms. long.

Table4 shows estimated change in modal shares of Delhi residents excluding people living in JJ clusters. Table5 shows estimated change in modal shares of Delhi residents including JJ clusters residents when the share of JJ cluster resident is 60% of the total population and when it is 50% percent of the total population. Modal shares have been estimated for both cases, since reliable numbers for this are not available. In both cases the estimated modal shares indicate the reduction in car and two wheeler traffic and increase in bicycle and pedestrians. Share of buses does not show any significant change, however the bus ride is expected to become more comfortable and convenient.

Table 4: Estimated Change in Modal Share in Delhi

Mode	Present Modal Share (1999)(%)**	Estimated change in modal share (%)
Cycle	*2.75*	10
Bus	*36.2*	37.65
Car	*28.35*	26.5
SC/MC	*29.29*	*22.5*
Auto	*1.74*	1.75
Walk	1.62	1.6
Total	**100**	**100**

** IIT survey

Table5: Estimated change in modal shares (after investment in bicycle infrastructure)

Mode	% of low income population 60%		Share of low income population 50%	
	Total trips	%share	Total trips	%share
Cycle	6.39	27	5.72	24
Bus	7.94	34	8.08	35
Car	2.48	11	3.10	13
SC/MC	2.45	10	2.92	12
Auto	0.30	1	0.32	1
Taxi	0.00	0	0.00	0
Rail	0.25	1	0.21	1
Others	0.33	1	0.27	1
Walk	3.26	14	2.78	12
Total	23.40	100	23.40	100

.

BENEFIT ESTIMATION

Increased Capacity

If a separate segregated lane is constructed for bicycles, the curbside lane, which is currently used by bicyclists becomes available to motorised traffic. This relatively small investment in bicycle lanes can increase the road space for motorised traffic by 50 percent on 3 lane roads. Bicycle lanes also result in better space utilisation. For instance a 3.5m wide lane has a carrying capacity of 1,800 cars per hour whereas it can carry 5,400 bicycles per hour (Replogle, 1991). Average occupancy of a car is 1.15 persons (IRC, 1999) and bicycle carries one person. This implies that in order to move the same number of people we would need 2.6 times the road area that would be required for bicyclists. Given the fact that there is not much space available to expand existing roads, the future mobility needs and projected trips can only be met by increasing the capacity of the existing road network. This can only be achieved by encouraging modes, which are more efficient in terms of space utilisation.

Motorised vehicles benefit because of improved capacity of the road and improvement in speeds. Capacity estimations of a typical arterial road in Delhi (Tiwari, 1999) show improvement in corridor capacity by 19-23% by providing an exclusive cycle track. If the full capacity of the corridor is utilised, i.e., provision of a high capacity bus lane in the left most lane can lead to capacity improvement by 56-73%(present carrying capacity of 23,000 passengers/h to 45,000 passengers/h).

Improved speeds

Improvement in speeds of motorised vehicles will be experienced until the corridor is full to capacity due to realisation of induced demand. Major beneficiaries of speed improvement are buses and two wheelers because curbside lane becomes available to them without interference from slow vehicles. Estimations of time savings experienced by bus commuters, car occupants and two wheeler commuters on a typical arterial corridor in Delhi (Katarzyna, 1999) show 48% reduction in time costs due to 50% improvement in bus speeds (from present 15km/h to 30 km/h) and 30% improvement in car and two wheelers.

Reduced congestion

Congestion has long been recognised as an environmental problem. Other than causing delay, it causes noise and fumes and increases health risks of road users and residents. Delhi as well as other Indian cities have invested in grade separated junctions and flyovers as one of the major congestion relief measure at an average cost of Rs. 100 million to 300 million for each intersection. However, detailed simulation of a major intersection in Delhi show that re-planning the junction to include separate NMV lanes and bus priority lane can bring in 80% improvement over the present level of delays. Cost of this measure is 25 times less than the proposed grade-separated junction. (Kartik, 1998)

Increased safety

By creating segregated bicycle lanes and re-designing intersections, conflicts between motorised traffic and bicyclists can be reduced substantially leading to a sharp decrease in the number of accidents and fatalities for bicyclists and motorised two-wheelers. Safety benefits estimated for a typical arterial in Delhi show 46% reduction in accident costs. This is because segregated facility reduces injury accidents by 40% and fatalities by 50%. (Katarzyna, 1998)

CONCLUSIONS

Public transport vehicles and non- motorised modes are the major modes of transport for majority of the city residents. The existing socio-economic patterns and landuse distribution ensures NMVs presence in the whole city, and on the complete road network. The densities and modal shares of NMVs in total traffic may differ from one part of the city to the other. However, as long as NMVs are present on the road, regardless of their numbers, all vehicles move under sub-optimal conditions. Efficient bus system cannot be designed without taking care of the slow vehicles (NMVs) on the road. . It is possible to redesign the existing roads to provide safe and convenient environment to non-motorized modes. The guiding principle of the proposed design is to meet the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists in terms of convenience, safety, and comfort. This requires not only altering road geometry and traffic management policies but also legitimising the services provided by hawkers and informal sector. The road network- straight roads and intersections- geometry has to be designed from the perspective of the pedestrians, bicyclists and public transport vehicles. This enables the existing space to be reorganised for giving priority to public transport-exclusive bus lanes, better designed bus shelters, spaces for vendors, and ricksha parking. These designs benefit all road users. This also results in improved efficiency of bus transport vehicles and enhanced capacity of the corridor when measured in number of passengers per hour per lane, substantial reduction in fatalities and vehicular emissions.

Since sustainable transport systems in Indian cities demand moving a large number of people by bus transport and NMVs, planning for NMVs is indispensable.

REFERENCES

IIT (2000), Road User Behavior and Traffic Violations in Delhi, report for SIAM, TRIPP, Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, Delhi, India.

Indian Road Congress (IRC, 1990), Guidelines for Capacity of Urban Roads in Plain Areas, New Delhi

Indian Road Congress (IRC, 1999), Guidelines for Capacity of Urban Roads in Plain Areas, New Delhi, India,

Katarzyna Tota (1999), The role of non-motorized transport in sustainable urban transport systems: A preliminary analysis of costs and benefits of non-motorized and bus priority measures on Vikas Marg. Delhi, prepared for TERI, April

Ministry of Environment and Forests (MOE, 1997), White Paper on Pollution in Delhi with an Action Plan, Delhi: Government of India.

Misra R.P. (1998), Urban India: Historical roots and contemporary scenario, in Million Cities of India ed. R.P.Misra, Kamlesh Misra, Sustainable Development Foundation, Delhi, India, pp52

Mohan, D. and Tiwari, G. (1997) Road safety in India: issues and concerns. Delhi: Transportation Research and Injury Prevention Programme, Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi, pp. 1-25.

ORG (1994), Household Travel Surveys in Delhi, Operations Research Group, Delhi, India, pp. 6-7.

Replogle M. (1991), Non-motorized vehicles in Asia: issues and strategies, The World Bank, Washington D.C.

RITES (1998) B. Route Rationalization and TimeTable Formulation Study for Bus System of Delhi. Delhi, India: Government of the National Capital Territory of Delhi.

RITES (1998) A, Traffic and Transportation Policies and Strategies in Urban Areas in India, Final Report, New Delhi for Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment, Government of India, March 1998, ppES-3.

Shanghai Municipal Government (1999). Strategy for Sustainable Development of Urban Transportation and Environment - for a Metropolis with Co-ordination Development of Transportation and Environment toward 21st Century. Workshop on Urban Transport and Environment, CICED, Beijing.

The Municipal Government of Shenzhen City (1999). To Make Shenzhen a Beautiful and Comfortable City by Perfecting Urban Planning and Promoting Transportation Management. Workshop on Urban Transport and Environment, CICED, Beijing.

Tiwari, G. (2000), and Economic Benefits of Cycling Infrastructure: Case study Delhi, report for ICE-Netherlands, TRIPP, Indian Institute of Technology, and Delhi, India.

Tiwari G, D. Mohan, J.Fazio, (1998), Conflict Analysis in Mixed Traffic Conditions, Accd. Anal. and Prev., Vol.30 No.2, pp.207-215

Tiwari G.(1999), Planning for non-motorized traffic-A prerequisite for sustainable transport system, IATSS Research, vol.23 No.2, pp70-77

Tiwari, G., D.Mohan et al(1998) Bicycle Master Plan for Delhi, Final Report submitted to Transport Department, Delhi Government, TRIPP, Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi.

V.Kartik (1998), Comparison of Alternate measures at AIIMS intersection, B.Tech. Thesis, Department of Civil Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi.

---

[i] G.Tiwari, D.Mohan et.al. Bicycle Master Plan for Delhi, Final Report submitted to Transport Department, Delhi Government, TRIPP, Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi, 1998.

[ii] Replogle M., Nonmotorised vehicles in Asia: issues and strategies, The World Bank, 1991

[iii] Indian Road Congress, Guidelines for Capacity of Urban Roads in Plain Areas, New Delhi, India, 1990

Figure 1. Road layout showing exclusive curbside buslane

Figure 2 Road layout showing central bus lane