

## **London Cycling Campaign response to Barnet Cycleway between Hornsey and North Finchley**

*8 July 2019*

<https://engage.barnet.gov.uk/Cycleway>

### **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 developed with input from LCC's borough groups.

### **General comments on this scheme:**

- This scheme is partially supported, but with very strong caveats.
- The principle and trial of modally filtering out through motor traffic from residential areas is supported, however it is very likely indeed the trial will introduce more problems than it solves as currently configured, and we strongly recommend improving the trial proposals before implementation, or at the least being very clear about the likely need to add further filtering to the area as a next step. If Barnet council proceeds as currently planned, it could put back the chance of a proper low traffic neighbourhood here, and the approach of modal filtering, in the borough significantly.
- Further individual elements of the scheme are also encouraging signs that Barnet council is beginning to take serious steps towards enabling more people to walk and cycle more and drive less. However, again, this scheme is not bold or direct enough to really deliver "mode shift" needed – as such it's supported primarily as an opportunity for the council to begin to build support for and political will around better, bolder "Active Travel" schemes in the future.

### **Specific points about this scheme:**

- This is a very indirect route, it avoids main roads, involves a large number of turning movements and includes some sections of route that are isolated. As such it is unlikely to enable far more people to cycle in, to or through the area.
- Barnet council, as a priority, should be considering TfL's Strategic Cycling Analysis (SCA) rather than spending considerable time and resources on schemes of limited value such as this, a) creating direct, high-quality main road schemes along the SCA highlighted corridors of highest potential, including from North Finchley to East Finchley (and on to Highgate and Archway), and b) creating "low traffic

neighbourhoods” that would naturally enable far more short cycle journeys than this scheme.

- Isolated sections of the route such as Forest Walk, around Orion Road and across Secret Park are unlikely to be used, even with significant improvements to lighting and sightlines, by a wide range of people, particularly after dark and in the winter.
- The turn from Orion Road onto the path to connect to Alexandra Road may be too sharp to ensure all abilities of rider and all types of cycle (including cargo bikes etc.) can make it. Sightlines at the crossing of Orion Road roundabout are also a concern for drivers and those cycling, particularly likely speeds of motor vehicles at this point.
- Given likely speeds of those driving across the Orion Road bridge over the north circular A406, segregation should be more substantial than “wands”.
- Martock Gardens could be further improved by narrowing the entry/exit lane widths and kerb radii. The layout could well be confusing currently and further design work here to reinforce cycling and driver behaviour would be welcome.
- Parking on the Service Road and Ramsden Road should be moved further from the junction due to sightlines.
- The proposed design of the cycle track on the corner of Goldsmith Road, as with the current design, needs parking restrictions and enforcement to ensure access to and from the track is safe and comfortable.
- On Friern Barnet Lane, more clarity is needed to ensure those driving understand those cycling have priority across vehicular access to properties. This could include raising the crossings, using give way markings etc.
- The refuge on Buxted Road at the junction with Friern Barnet Lane should be designed to be large enough to cope with cargo and other wider cycles and/or multiple people waiting simultaneously.
- The proposed trial of a single modal filter on the junction of Ashurst Road and Buxted Road is welcome, however it is very unlikely that on its own it will sufficiently reduce or remove through motor traffic from either the alignment of the proposed Cycleway or the area. Indeed, it could even result in increased motor traffic along the route. Barnet council should urgently seek expertise on “low traffic neighbourhoods” and how to design them (see <https://lcc.org.uk/pages/low-traffic-neighbourhoods> for example). These schemes are not to be embarked on without a clear plan for the area and contingency plans too.
- The current single filter will not sufficiently remove north-south or east-west non-local motor traffic from these streets, but instead concentrate them on the remaining streets inside the “cell” area. The result may well be that residents do not see the benefits of the scheme proposed, and indeed come to see significant

disbenefits for low traffic neighbourhood treatments in general. As examples, north-south through motor traffic could easily divert to Grove Road or Lewes Road to continue driving through the “cell” – and both of these would then likely impact the Cycleway route negatively, as well as cause significant impacts on the residents of those streets. East-west through motor traffic could easily use Buxted, Ashford and Friern Park – with again increases to motor traffic along the Cycleway alignment and disbenefits for residents, or Torrington Park, again causing disbenefits.

- At the very least, Barnet council should have a robust plan in place to adapt and improve the trial after six months to then trial further filters or other restrictions to the area (High Road, Woodhouse Road, Friern Barnet Lane and the North Middlesex Golf Club are the obvious cell boundaries) to more completely remove through motor traffic from all the residential streets in the area.
- Without camera enforcement or further physical measures, it is possible the Horsham Avenue point no-entry will be widely flouted by drivers.
- “Visual” speed cushions are of incredibly limited use at controlling driver speeds. There appears little reason why sinusoidal, full-width speed humps could not be used on this road instead. And it is clear from the existing and proposed interventions here that driver speed is already an issue. Those cycling should not be mixed along the route with high volumes of motor traffic or speeds routinely above 20mph.
- Such speed control should be particularly noticeable at the entrance to Friern Park from High Road A1000 – a raised table should be installed here as a minimum.
- The scheme fails to link appropriately onward to other schemes or cycle routes, particularly at the Friern Park end – either a further scheme on the High Road A1000 or at least to cross it, is needed. The A1000 is a clear contender for cycle tracks and is highlighted as such on TfL’s SCA.

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

- The Mayor’s Transport Strategy relies on a growth in cycle trips to keep London moving. This means infrastructure schemes must 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.
- Evidence from TfL and from many schemes in London, the UK and worldwide shows the economic benefits, including to businesses, to be found from enabling a wider range of people to cycle more. Further evidence shows how cycling schemes also benefit air quality and reduce climate changing emissions, as well as improving resident health outcomes and reducing inactivity, as mentioned above.
- 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. Above 2,000 Passenger Car Unit (PCUs) motor vehicle movements per day, or 20mph motor traffic speeds, cycling should be physically separated from motor traffic.