

London Cycling Campaign

7 September 2016

Enfield Ponders End mini-Holland

<http://cycleenfield.co.uk/major-projects/ponders-end/>

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. Its response was developed with input from the co-chairs of LCC's Infrastructure Review Group and in support of the response from the Enfield Cycling Campaign, the borough group.

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.

LCC wants, as a condition of funding, all "Mini-Holland" 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.

LCC has the following specific points on the scheme and its surrounds:

- This appears to be a statutory consultation, yet there does not appear to have been a more general prior consultation associated with the scheme. These comments are to be taken as general consultation comments.
- At several points (for instance opposite Garfield Road), parking bays are located on the pavement, with the cycle lane running between the bays and carriageway. This will mean: any physical protection for people cycling disappears; there is a risk of vehicles crossing the lane and colliding with cycles using the lane; there is greater risk of drivers "dooring" those cycling in the lane. These dangers could be minimised by placing the parking bays between the cycle track and the carriageway, as proposed for the A105, improving safety and protection.
- Side roads throughout should feature similar designs to reduce the potential for collisions between people driving out of side roads and people cycling. These designs should include narrow entry/exit widths and radii, with a raised table. If "continuous footways" or "blended crossings" are installed on side streets these should only be on those with very low motor traffic flows.
- Bus stop "boarder" designs require a buffer, as the designs on other Cycle Enfield schemes proposed thus far.
- The central area of the scheme appears to feature contrasting block sections of paving with no cycle track. The cycle track should continue through this section with appropriate measures also to control motor vehicle speed. These block sections also are often a maintenance issue, longer term.
- The two "implied" roundabouts represent a serious barrier to cycling for a broader demographic of people – they do not enable "all ages, all abilities" cycling. Given the high volume of motor vehicle traffic on the street here (over 12,000 daily motor vehicle movements according to the DfT's traffic counts site), conditions for cycling and crossing as a pedestrian will likely be very hostile indeed with this design. The likely answer is signals are needed here to separate pedestrians and those cycling from motor vehicle movements in time and/or space.

- Semi-segregated measures should continue through the Clarence Road area.