

Ealing Cycle Plan 2018-2021

1 March 2018

https://www.ealing.gov.uk/info/201042/current_consultations/2431/cycling_plan_consultation

About the London Cycling Campaign

London Cycling Campaign (LCC) is a charity with more than 40,000 supporters of whom 12,000 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 and is in support of the response from the Ealing Cycling Campaign.

General comments:

This plan is strongly supported. The vision for cycling, the key objectives and much of the plan to deliver on these is good. However, the following issues should be considered:

Specific points about the scheme:

- Funding – it is vital, particularly given the ambition of the plan, that Ealing takes rapid and practical steps to fulfil it in reality. This means aggressively seeking out funding from all possible streams (TfL, Section 106, CIL etc.). And it means ensuring every Highways scheme or major development in Ealing going forward matches the approach, ambition and objectives of the plan.
- A40 – given TfL's Strategic Cycling Analysis (SCA) does not include the A40 as a high priority route, nor, beyond Wembley, does it pass through areas of high potential cycling and walking, it is surprising that Ealing Council are prioritising it so highly, and it is likely other routes that are highlighted on the SCA should be prioritised in preference – such as the Southall-Ealing-Acton-Shepherd's Bush, Ealing-Wembley, Southall-Hounslow etc. corridors.
- 3.2.1 – when designing 20mph zones it is vital these are designed on the basis of physical design for 20mph, rather than expected enforcement or behaviour change through signage.
- 3.2.2 – secure cycle parking facilities are vital, but so are "on street" (e.g. Sheffield stand) parking too – for journeys to transport hubs, retail destinations, civic amenities etc. And these should not be overlooked.
- 3.2.3 "The Council will enable secure home cycle parking solutions where required" - amend "where required" to "wherever possible, prioritising areas and locations of high demand"?
- 4.5 Delivery barriers - road carriageways "Minimum is 3.5m per carriageway to accommodate two vehicles passing each other, on busier roads this would need to

accommodate buses and HGVs." TfL standard for roads with buses and HGVs is 3.25m. 3.5m falls into the area defined as a "critical issue" in TfL's London Cycling Design Standards and so therefore should be avoided. Wider carriageways also facilitate higher motor vehicle speeds. Carriageways where separate cycling facilities are not provided should be either 3.25m where buses are, 3m or over 4m otherwise. However it is important to note that LCC policy is to separate flows of cycling from motor vehicles on any road with greater than 2,000 PCUs of motor vehicle traffic daily or greater than 20mph speeds.

- 6.1 Cycle network and routes - Secondary routes: "Segregation where necessary (based on collision levels, traffic speeds and volumes) – probably light segregation otherwise shared lanes". Segregated cycle track facilities should also be considered for any section of road where coherence implies a continuation of facility in similar design. In other words, it is not comfortable for those cycling to switch rapidly and/or often back and forth between segregated tracks and shared lanes. Also, stepped tracks or full kerb segregation offers greater feelings of protection than semi- or light segregation and stepped tracks also are usable in locations where semi-segregated approaches take up too much space. Therefore these approaches should be considered where appropriate also.
- In network/route analysis, priority should be given to routes reaching and connecting to other high potential routes and also to transport interchanges, major employment centres, key amenities etc. to form a true network of usable routes in the borough. Given Dutch design experience and TfL's Strategic Cycling Analysis, journey lengths of under 6km should be particularly prioritised.
- It is important to understand that "tertiary routes" will often require the implementation of "Cycle Zones" - creating tertiary routes without considering the broader area tends to be difficult to do at a high enough quality.
- There should also be consideration of what to do at the edges of "Cycle Zones" etc. and how main road routes and zones and/or tertiary routes interact. For instance, "porosity" measures such as parallel crossings to cross main roads, or cycle tracks on main roads to allow people to leave their home "Zone" and travel to nearby amenities. In other words, the arrival of a Cycle Zone may also increase the priority of delivering crossings and main road tracks on the roads surrounding the zone.
- 6.4 Cycling in schools - not just schools, but all civic stakeholders (GPs, Primary Care Trusts, Universities etc.), should be engaged and challenged over active travel. And much more must be done with schools to encourage Senior Leadership Teams and other internal bodies to engage with an active travel agenda, including focussing on "active travel plans" that really encourage and enable schools to reduce car use by staff, parents etc.
- 7.2 Delivery plan - detail - Uxbridge Road "Segregated cycle lanes (where possible)". Cycle routes should be coherent and comfortable. If tracks appear and disappear at sections, they simply won't be used, nor will they result in mode shift or an increase in cycling. A scheme is only worth implementing if it can be done continuously over a decent distance. Therefore it

is imperative phrases such as “where possible” are not used often.

- 8.1 Objectives and targets – these are not necessarily ambitious enough to genuinely realise Ealing's stated ambitions to be "an exemplar for cycling, where cycling is safe and the primary choice for short distance travel" and should be revisited.
- Budget split - the plan should consider the likely split of budget between route infrastructure, behaviour change, promotion and marketing, consultants, comms/engagement, parking infrastructure etc. The vast majority of spending should be on design and construction of infrastructure.
- Junctions and major barriers - there is too little detail on tackling major junctions, and also on tackling major permeability barriers in Ealing - major roads such as the north circular, train lines, rivers etc.
- Beyond the bicycle - the plan makes mention of dockless hire, e-bikes and cargo bikes to enable a wider range of people to cycle, but there is no mention of adapted cycles. All of these types of cycle have high potential to enable more people and a wider range of people to cycle (and potentially for longer distances). These are vital to consider both in terms of accessible infrastructure, but also hire and loan schemes etc.
- Green spaces - the plan should include provision for leisure cycling in Ealing's many green spaces, and access by cycling to them.

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.
- 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.