

## **Barking & Dagenham Local Implementation Plan (draft LIP3)**

*28 November 2018*

<https://www.lbdd.gov.uk/roads-and-transport-policy>

### **About the London Cycling Campaign**

London Cycling Campaign (LCC) is a charity with more than 20,000 supporters of whom over 11,000 are fully paid-up members. We speak up on behalf of everyone who cycles or wants to cycle in Greater London; and we speak up for a greener, healthier, happier and better-connected capital.

This response was led by Colin Newman, Barking & Dagenham resident and cycling campaigner in association with LCC.

### **General comments on the LIP3:**

We welcome the opportunity to comment on Barking & Dagenham (B&D) council's Local Implementation Plan (LIP). We are generally encouraged by the many mentions of cycling throughout the document, accepting that it is a vital form of transport.

We do have some concerns, however, about the specifics of some ideas, the lack of specifics in other ideas, and the absence of some projects from the LIP3.

### **Targets:**

The target for increasing the modal share of cycling to 57% in 2021 from a baseline of 56% is not challenging enough.

The LIP3 is too light on targets in general, including interim targets towards a 2041 end goal. Greater clarity on the B&D roadmap on key cycle routes as part of this is required – with clear targets for achieving either kilometres of safe, high-quality route and/or coverage of residents within 400m of such.

### **Strategic Cycling Network:**

One of the key proposals for cycling in the Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS) is that 70% of London residents live within 400m of the Strategic Cycling Network – a network of high-quality, safe cycling routes largely identified in Transport for London's (TfL) Strategic Cycling Analysis (SCA). The LIP3 should clearly identify routes aligned with the SCA with an aim to fulfil them, but there is very little detail about these routes in the LIP3.

While provision of more Quietways is potentially welcome, as these can make an important contribution to cycling, the LIP3 gives undue weight to them, whilst fully-protected cycle tracks along main roads, which will also be needed to fulfil key SCA corridors, are under-played.

The SCA corridors and zones are viewable in zoomable map format here

<http://camdencyclists.org.uk/tfl-SCA-maptiles/SCA-fig5.1trans/leaflet.html> and

<http://camdencyclists.org.uk/tfl-SCA-maptiles/SCA-fig4.2/leaflet.html> (use the slider in the top right corner to set opacity).

### **Barking Riverside:**

There is good cycling infrastructure in Barking Riverside , but both River Road and Renwick Road are poorly maintained, rarely swept, and what cycle tracks and footways exist are often blocked by illegally parked vehicles. This cycling infrastructure, in what should be a healthy new town, will also be of very limited use without good quality and safe connections to destinations beyond the development area.

This is highlighted in the SCA, with a corridor marked to/from Barking Riverside and Barking (and connecting to routes toward central London) as one of the highest potential cycling routes in London, and towards Rainham and Dagenham as high potential connections also. The Strategic Cycling Analysis also highlights Barking Riverside as one of the zones of potential highest growth in cycling in London – considering demographics and the current journeys made there by car that could easily be cycled (if safe, comfortable cycling routes were available). It is therefore imperative that the LIP3 answers how the council will work with TfL to fulfil these corridors and ensure areas of high potential such as Riverside are also enabled.

### **Cycle Superhighway CS3:**

The proposal to extend CS3 eastward is welcome, and while the LIP3 document is not the right context for full details, more detail on this proposal in the LIP3 document should be feasible.

### **Valence Avenue (and others):**

The ambition to provide fully-segregated cycling facilities on some of the borough's wide roads is welcome, but the proposal to use central reservations for this raises considerable concerns.

Such an approach would involve more crossings of general carriageways than conventional cycle track approaches, would also potentially deplete greenery, and would likely not be sufficiently comfortable, legible and usable to enable a far wider range of people to cycle here (while also likely to be ignored as impractical to be used by current, faster cyclists). It would be better, we think, to deliver cycle tracks on either side of the road ("with flow" ideally).

If this approach is an attempt to avoid affecting motor vehicle capacity and/or flow here, this is not compatible with the council's stated aim of reducing car use and dependency.

More detail, in keeping with the borough's stated "strong cooperative/partnership working arrangements", on this approach would be welcome before any final assessment is made.

### **Permeability:**

The commitment to "exploring innovative traffic calming and reduction measures, such as filtered permeability schemes, to help meet the safety concerns of residents and vulnerable road users" is welcome, but this is an overly tentative commitment. A more specific and bolder pledge to move forward such schemes to create "low traffic neighbourhoods" would be better: for example, to create a specific number of such neighbourhoods where through motor traffic is removed or heavily discouraged each year (or covering a specific number of households each year).

A pledge to fix legacy permeability issues would also be welcome. These include:

- Roads blocked off to prevent rat-running but without cycle exemption.
- Paths taken out of use for anti-social/crime reasons (which should be tackled using other methods, so that paths can be used as intended.)

- Steps without wheeling ramps.
- Otherwise cycleable paths without dropped kerbs at both / either ends.
- “No entry” restrictions and banned turns inappropriately applied to those cycling.
- One-way streets without contra-flow for cycling.
- Gyratory systems such as at “Stag Island”, which should be removed or at the minimum redesigned for safe, comfortable cycling.
- Missing quieter (and sometimes shorter) off-road routes, where there is no access to parks at the appropriate place.

#### **River crossings:**

Two crossings of the River Roding (in the Barking Riverside area and near Freshwarf) are both designated as bus/transit crossings. It is important that both these crossings incorporate cycling from the outset. A further river crossing of the Roding would enable the long-planned National Cycle Network route along the Thames north bank and River Roding. This is not covered (or even mentioned) in the LIP3, but should be.

#### **London Cycle Network (LCN):**

There is no mention of the existing LCN and LCN+ routes. These are of highly variable quality and amenity, but they are still an asset that the council should manage. On LCN13, which was audited in 2003, the council put up “no cycling” signs (now removed) and “cyclists dismount” signs (still present). This suggests an incomplete review of the schemes and a failure in asset management.

#### **Road maintenance:**

Dealing with road surface defects is arguably of more strategic importance to cycling than other forms of transport. Though potholes may damage motor vehicles and make their occupants uncomfortable, cyclists are vulnerable to what may happen if their bike hits a pothole, or if they swerve to avoid one, or if they give too much attention to them rather than the road around them. Therefore, as part of the palette of cycling measures, specific attention should be given to fixing hazardous potholes on roads used most often by those cycling and to maintaining road surfaces in a fit state for cycling

#### **Training:**

Improving cycling skills is valuable, but care should be taken not to over-emphasise its benefits in comparison to systemic road danger reduction. The LIP3 statement “providing cycle training to cyclists” is, it is assumed, an error – and we assume you mean that cycle training will in fact remain available to all, not just current cyclists.

#### **Cycle storage at home:**

Despite the provision of formal cycle storage for residents of the borough’s many new developments, there is a tendency to store bikes on balconies. This chimes in with anecdotal evidence that residents are unaware of bike stores and that some of them are being used to store other items. These problems need addressing to ensure residents are catered for and aware of cycle storage options available to them.

#### **General points about infrastructure schemes:**

- LCC requires infrastructure schemes to be designed to accommodate growth in cycling. Providing space for cycling is a more efficient use of road space than providing space for driving private motor vehicles, particularly for journeys of 5km or less. In terms of providing maximum efficiency for space and energy use, walking, cycling, then public transport are key.
- As demonstrated by the success of recent Cycle Superhighways and mini-Holland projects etc., people cycle when they feel safe. For cycling to become mainstream, a network of high-quality, direct routes separate from high volumes and/or speeds of motor vehicle traffic is required to/from all key destinations and residential areas in an area. Schemes should be planned, designed and implemented to maximise potential to increase journeys – with links to nearby amenities, residential centres, transport hubs considered from the outset.
- Spending money on cycling infrastructure has been shown to dramatically boost health outcomes in an area. Spending on cycling schemes outranks all other transport modes for return on investment according to a DfT study. Schemes which promote cycling meet TfL's "Healthy Streets" checklist. A healthy street is one where people choose to cycle.
- All schemes should be designed to enable people of all ages and abilities to cycle, including disabled people.
- LCC wants, as a condition of funding, all highway development designed to London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS), with a Cycling Level of Service (CLOS) rating of 70 or above, with all "critical issues" eliminated.