

London Cycling Campaign

1 June

Brent Alperton Community School Road Safety Improvements Phase 2

http://brent-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/ens/htdel/alperton_community_school_road_safety_improvements_phase_2

This consultation response is on behalf of the London Cycling Campaign, the capital's leading cycling organisation with more than 12,000 members and 30,000 supporters. The LCC welcomes the opportunity to comment on proposals. The response is in support of the response from Brent Cyclists, London Cycling Campaign's local branch, and was developed with input from the co-chairs of LCC's Infrastructure Review Group.

This scheme is not supported. It is not bold enough to enable many more people to walk or cycle through the area, along Ealing Road or across it, to and from the school or to other destinations. And thus will fail to deliver on the premise that the scheme will: "create a Healthy Street by transforming the quality of the pedestrian environment along Ealing Road and providing an attractive, accessible and people-friendly street. This will in turn reduce vehicle speeds and encourage children to walk and cycle to school."

Specific points about the scheme:

- The scheme fails to tackle motor vehicle dominance in the area. The school is located directly next to a Piccadilly line tube station, on a road with multiple bus routes and with large amounts of residential streets within walking distance. Ealing Road is, however, designated an A road, is a much-used motor vehicle through route and features approximately 12,000 motor vehicle movements along it daily (source: DfT) with over 600 buses daily. The scheme as it stands will not reduce motor vehicle volumes and speeds. Given this, it's unlikely it will be successful in encouraging, let alone enabling, many more students or people in the area to walk or cycle.
- Segregated cycle tracks – which there appear to be space for here – would dramatically increase the likelihood of people cycling to/from school, particularly if implemented as part of a comprehensive network in the area combining tracks on high motor vehicle volume/speed streets and suitably low motor traffic volume/speed streets (<2,000PCUs and <20mph). (And given large amounts of the nearby area effectively already form or could easily be modified to form "modal filter cells", this should be considered as a matter of urgency.)
- An area-wide plan to reduce vehicle movements would also be needed to enable walking and cycling to grow in mode share here. Atlip Road, for instance, features large amounts of car parking for residents and the businesses. As a matter of urgency, the council should develop plans to reduce car usage and parking here – and thus reduce motor vehicle turning

movements into and out of the road.

- The scheme as currently envisaged is not fit to be labelled a “Healthy Street”. It is not likely to create conditions to match the ten key indicators of a Healthy Street – pedestrians from all walks of life will not walk here, people will not choose to walk and certainly won’t choose to cycle here, people will not feel relaxed, there won’t be clean air, it will be too noisy, there will not be places where it is attractive to stop and rest, it will not feel safe and there will be little to see and do. Given this, labelling this scheme in this manner will not create a “Healthy Street” and risks devaluing the emerging “Healthy Streets” brand identity.
- Speed cushions introduce conflict between motor vehicles and those cycling and fail to reduce speeds – these should be replaced with full-width raised tables or sinusoidal humps. Very long raised tables are also not ideal for reducing motor vehicle speeds
- Side roads junctions for low traffic roads should be narrow and tight, with ideally “continuous footways” and a cycle track raised across the mouth to ensure pedestrian and cycling priority.
- Loading bays inset to the pavement, particularly with cycle logos in the “door zone” represent an unacceptable risk to those who currently cycle, and a hostile barrier to those who might consider cycling in the area.

General points about cycling schemes:

- LCC requires 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 mode 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.
- 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 Fails” eliminated.