

Adam Smith  
[transportation@brent.gov.uk](mailto:transportation@brent.gov.uk)

## **London Cycling Campaign**

5 December 2016

### **Carlton Vale**

[http://brent-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/ens/carlton\\_vale\\_walking\\_cycling\\_improvements](http://brent-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/ens/carlton_vale_walking_cycling_improvements)

This consultation response is on behalf of the London Cycling Campaign, the capital's leading cycling organisation with more than 12,000 members and 40,000 supporters. The LCC welcomes the opportunity to comment on plans. The response is in support of the responses from Brent Cyclists and Westminster Cycling Campaign, the borough groups, and was developed with input from the co-chairs of LCC's Infrastructure Review Group.

LCC is supportive of the proposed improvements.

Specific points about the scheme:

- Wherever possible, semi-segregated protection (at a minimum) should be used to separate cycle flows on these busy roads from motor vehicles. Ideal would be further physical separation – stepped tracks or fully segregated kerbed tracks. That should include Kilburn Lane and the southern side of Carlton Vale in Westminster.
- Junctions to side streets should prioritise safe and comfortable passage for those cycling. This could include “blended crossings” or “continuous footways” with the side street featuring narrowed entry/exit, a raised table, paving crossing the junction mouth and ideally a modally-filtered residential area treatment beyond, to reduce turning movements in and out of side streets to a minimum. At the bare minimum, raised tables should be considered for all side streets in this scheme and entry/exit points for tracks should directly line up and be prioritised across side streets (ie at Fernhead Road the stop lines should be set back to line up with the track and there should be a raised table in line with this; while Cambridge Road, Neville Close etc. should feature suitable treatments).
- 20mph limits should run throughout the scheme.
- If pedestrian refuges or other “pinch points” are to be included that see effective lane width between 3.2-4.0m, those cycling must be fully protected at these points.
- There needs to be sufficient “buffer” space between parked cars and any cycle track to minimise any risk of either “dooring” or people stepping suddenly into the cycle track.

## 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 an aim for a Cycling Level of Service (CLoS) rating of 70 or above, with all "Critical Fails" eliminated.