# **City of London Transport Strategy**

11 January 2019

https://www.citystreets.london/

## 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 strategy:

We strongly support the visions, aims and the proposals contained in the City of London's new transport strategy and have <u>publicly commended</u> the City for taking this important step forward

Indeed, if the City moves forward with this strategy, it will dramatically improve the area for those walking and cycling and set a new benchmark for London in terms of enabling and increasing "active travel" rates. It will also send a strong signal that the City is reimagining itself for the twenty-first century, as a world class place to do business and visit.

LCC broadly supports all of the specific proposals in the strategy, with the following (minor) caveats.

#### Specific points on this strategy:

- The proposed increase in cycling journeys by 2044 appears relatively unambitious, compared to the Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS). TfL are targeting quadrupled cycling journeys by 2041, approximately doubling them from current levels by 2023. Given how ambitious the City is being in much of its strategy, then, it should aim for higher cycling journey increases than currently proposed (of a 50% increase by 2030, 100% by 2044).
- In the "core cycling network" the approach proposed is to either deliver protected space for cycling or reduce motor vehicle volumes to "below 150 vehicles an hour in each direction" on all routes. As a rough estimate, 150 vehicles in the peak hours could easily result in over 1,500 vehicles per day, or over 3,000 counting both directions. The Dutch <u>CROW</u> manual recommends protecting cyclists as a priority above 1,500 vehicles (counting both directions), while LCC policy demands it above 2,000 Passenger Car equivalent Units (PCUs). Even at these volumes of motor traffic, cycling can remain a fairly hostile experience. So LCC recommends that the City's approach aims to deliver such volumes as an initial step, with further separation

and/or volume reductions as required, in the longer term.

- The same issue may need to be considered with regards to "Local Access streets", that also are aimed to be below "150 vehicles per hour in each direction at the busiest time of day".
- Similarly, the proposal where "protected cycle lanes" are used to deliver "a
  minimum of 1.5m wide per direction of travel... with 2m wide... wherever possible" is
  likely to need revisiting in the medium to long term. As cycling flows increase, such
  widths are likely to result in capacity issues fairly rapidly.
- The issue of proximity to start/end point of journey, the width of tracks and indeed the volume of motor traffic on the "core cycling network" are also particularly important to those who don't currently cycle in the City – including those the City would particularly seek to enable using "non-standard cycles, such as cargo cycles or adapted cycles".
- "The use of pedestrianised streets by cycles will be decided on a case-by-case basis to ensure people walking and cycling feel safe and comfortable." It is vital that planning and provision for cycling is also embedded in each pedestrianisation case that comes forward, and in each "pedestrian priority" street that comes forward. Cycling journeys that are circuitous, disjointed or unnecessarily slow are unattractive and will not encourage more journeys to be made by cycle. "Designing-in" good cycle access to most streets will minimise pedestrian-cycle conflict and enable a wide range of cycles (delivery cargo bikes, adapted cycles etc.) to access most destinations. This means that full pedestrianisation without cycling access should be used sparingly and cautiously, and that pedestrian priority streets should be designed with any likely cycle through routes in mind to minimise conflicts between modes.
- In a similar vein, while we support maximising green time for pedestrians over motor traffic at signalised crossings, it is again important that the impact of signalling changes on cycling journeys through and to the City is considered carefully in this approach. Repeatedly holding those cycling for long periods of time at successive lights is likely to encourage antisocial cycling behaviour, and will reduce the amenity of cycling. "Green wave" light phasing is increasingly used on the continent and, indeed, in London along routes such as Cycle Superhighway CS6 to enable a steady cycling flow.
- LCC also supports diagonal pedestrian crossings, but again, these should be considered carefully within the context of the proposed "core cycling network", cycling turning movements and/or space needed to ensure cycle routes are maintained.
- In "Proposal 17: keeping pavements free of obstructions", consideration of electric vehicle charging infrastructure should also be factored into the planning of the City (see also "Proposal 30: Install additional electric vehicle charging infrastructure").

Such charging points should generally be located off-street – and the City should have a plan for such points. But where located on-street, they should be located so as to not obstruct pavements, not leave trailing cables as trip hazards *and* so as not to reduce the ability to deliver (future) core cycle routes.

 The City's pioneering efforts to reduce collisions involving lorries are also welcome. The City was London's first Construction Logistics and Community Safety (CLOCS) champion and all City sites are expected to meet CLOCS standards. To further reduce road danger, the City should reflect the advances in TfL procurement standards which will, as of October 2019, require the use of vehicles with a minimum one star direct vision rating and three stars as of 2024. TfL also requires the sites used by contractors for landfill delivery to accommodate such vehicles and not select for more hazardous off-road designs.

#### 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.