

London Cycling Campaign

4 January 2017

Quietway 2 – Mare Street between London Lane and St Thomas's Square

https://consultation.hackney.gov.uk/streetscene/mare-street-cycle-link-between-london-lane-and-st/consult_view

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

The scheme as currently proposed is not supported. The improvements the scheme as currently proposed brings are not strong enough without further action to encourage all ages and all abilities of people to cycle along Quietway 2 and if the scheme remains as is, Mare Street will remain a key barrier on Quietway 2 – and thus the scheme is not considered a positive use of cycle funding. However, improvements to the scheme listed below could easily create a far better scheme that would boost cycling numbers and diversity, and be supported.

Specific points about the scheme:

- For this scheme to be a success and ensure that the Quietway works as a continuous route, it must enable those less confident at cycling to cross Mare Street calmly, comfortably and safely. The current scheme does not. A signalised crossing would be ideal, but at the very least, a parallel "tiger" crossing should be investigated.
- The decision to bring forward a proposal to modally filter London Lane is welcome (and the full filter, rather than no entry is a far superior option). But all modal filter schemes should consider the wider area. St Thomas's Square/Loddiges Road is a popular through route for motor vehicle traffic – and without filtering this will remain far too busy and intimidating for many people to cycle. Furthermore, both sides of Mare Street should be considered as modal filter cell areas – otherwise any proposals risks simply concentrating through traffic on fewer streets and increasing driver aggression, while failing to reduce overall motor vehicle traffic volumes and risking increasing hostility on streets just beyond the current scheme's boundaries.
- The proposed scheme relies in several places on signage to modify driver behaviour rather than physical design interventions. The likelihood is that significant numbers of drivers will ignore any "point no entry" on London Lane, the banned turn signs and the cycle-only signage on the turn refuges (this signage is also confusing as in one direction cycles and motor vehicles will currently be encouraged to turn using the same space). Physically designing out behaviour would be far better – so all modal filters should use bollards or other method (collapsible or lockable for

emergency service access) rather than just signs, and all refuges should feature bollards also or other physical filtering method to stop drivers using cycling facilities. At the very least, those cycling should not have to share turning/waiting space with motor vehicles.

- The current entry/exit at St Thomas's Square should be improved – with steeper ramps on the raised table, cobbles replaced with more suitable cycling surface and the entry/exit width should be narrowed to one lane to encourage slow motor vehicle speeds if the street is not modally filtered. Both London Lane and St Thomas's Square would ideally be entrance points to modally filtered cells – and as such their Mare Street junction points would be suitable for “continuous footway” or “blended crossing” treatment (these should always feature entrance/exit designs that encourage slow and courteous driver behaviour, and should only be used on streets with low traffic volumes where drivers are likely to behave calmly).
- The current proposed routing for Quietway 2 is along Churchwell Path. This is a rather narrow space, shared with pedestrians, and features entrances to a nursery and playground etc. Therefore careful design, or a more appropriate routing, is required to avoid capacity issues for the route and/or increasing issues between those cycling and pedestrians in these sections.

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 “Quietways” 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.