

Enfield Town

11 December 2015

<http://cycleenfield.co.uk/have-your-say/enfield-town-road-scheme-consultation/>

1 Do you support the proposals for Enfield Town?

Option 1

Yes, I support option one

Option two

Partially, I support option two

Please tell us why you have selected the option(s) above:

The London Cycling Campaign is the capital's leading cycling organisation with more than 12,000 members and 40,000 supporters. We welcome the opportunity to comment on these plans and our response has been developed in partnership with the chairs of our Infrastructure Review Group and the local Enfield Cycling Campaign.

This scheme offers a real opportunity to revitalise a town centre – particularly the north side of the shopping parade on Church Street. And offers real advantages to cyclists coming to the town centre or passing through.

Option 1 is far preferable as it offers simpler tracks and junctions for cyclists along Church Street – avoiding putting cyclists between two bus lanes running in the opposite direction from each other.

Both options have issues however. Some junctions retain hook risks and will feel unpleasant to less confident cyclists to navigate. And both options neglect Genotin Road – where the proposed cycle hub is located next to Enfield Town station.

We would like to see hook risks eliminated for cyclists at the Genotin/Church Street junction – both for those turning south into Genotin and for those carrying on westbound on Church Street, who currently have to cross a lane of traffic to do so, apparently because of the taxi rank. We would also like to see tracks along the length of Genotin to ensure cyclists can safely and conveniently access the proposed cycle hub. To achieve that, a “bus stop bypass” should be considered.

We are very concerned to see the introduction of early release and two stage right facilities at the Church Street/London Road junction. Early release does not eliminate hook risks for cyclists and is essentially useless for any cyclists arriving during the green phase. As such it is not a suitable solution for less confident cyclists and high-quality routes. In the same way, two-stage right implementations so far in London have added disproportionate wait times to cyclists using junctions.

The Genotin Road/London Road/Cecil Road also appears to offer little in terms of safety or convenience for cyclists – with hook risks evident on several arms. And Cecil Road as a whole is an issue – particularly for cyclists seeking to access the planned Greenway route along Sydney Road.

The use of bus stop “boarders” is also a concern anywhere the bus stop is popular and likely to feature large numbers of pedestrians waiting or entering or alighting from the bus. Elsewhere in London this has led to direct conflict between cyclists and pedestrians. Similarly loading bays, such as on London Road, should be designed to include a gap for doors opening onto the track. An ideal gap would be 1m.

Side roads such as St Andrews Road, Silver Street, Little Park Gardens, Raleigh Road and Sydney Road should also be appropriately treated to reduce vehicle entry/exit speeds and minimise conflict with cyclists in the carriageway or on a track. As such raised tables, or other treatments (including modal filters, “Copenhagen” or “blended” crossings etc.) should be considered.

On a general point, many of the cycle tracks are under 2m, some also have semi-segregated measures inside that width. As per London Cycle Design Standards, these widths are far from optimal. Reducing the ability for cyclists at different speeds to overtake each other reduces the effectiveness of these tracks for a broad audience of all ages, all abilities cyclists.

The result of the use of lower quality junction treatments and tracks could be a reputational risk to Enfield. Firstly, these issues mean significant barriers to less confident and newer cyclists remain, that could see Enfield missing its modal share targets. Secondly, junction designs that introduce long waits (two-stage rights, for instance) are seeing lower levels of compliance by current cyclists when introduced elsewhere in London. Which will risk failing to demonstrate to non-cycling residents the benefits of the scheme.

Finally, and in general, the London Cycling Campaign would like to see all schemes given a CLoS rating (as well as adhering to the latest London Cycle Design Standards) that demonstrates significant improvement from the current layout will be achieved for cycling, and that eliminates all “critical fails” in any proposed design before being funded for construction, let alone public consultation.