

## **Harrow Metropolitan cycle route**

8 December 2017

<https://consult.harrow.gov.uk/consult.ti/metcyc/consultationHome>

This consultation response is on behalf of the London Cycling Campaign, the capital's leading cycling organisation with more than 12,000 members and 30,000 supporters. The LCC welcomes the opportunity to comment on proposals. This response was developed with input from Harrow Cycling Campaign, London Cycling Campaign's local branch, and LCC's Infrastructure Advisory Panel.

This scheme is opposed. Unlike Harrow Council's 2013 Metropolitan cycle route proposals in the mini-Holland bid, which consisted of segregated cycle paths along important desire lines, this proposal will not improve conditions sufficiently on a quieter route to enable a wider range of people to cycle. In fact, it routes those cycling through dangerous conditions that are "critical issues" in both TfL's Healthy Streets Check and Cycling Level of Service matrixes and features numerous breaks in quality provision. Signing this route and painting bicycle symbols on the road will be a waste of money and should not be funded.

### **Specific points about this scheme:**

- Routes through this area are marked as featuring very high potential to cycle in TfL's Strategic Cycling Analysis, and were included in the council's 2013 proposals. This includes the approximate alignment of this route, but also south of North Harrow Station, via Rayner's Lane station, to Northolt Park. This scheme not only is likely to fail to fulfil the potential east-west through this area, but also north-south. The original proposed routes should be returned to, rapidly. The current proposal avoids important destinations on the original route. A corridor with this level of potential should follow the main desire lines closely – including via Rayner's Lane.
- For a scheme aimed at providing a route "using quieter and safer residential streets", this route both crosses and proceeds along the A4090. This road is not quieter or safer. Above 2,000 PCUs and/or 20mph, physical separation between motor traffic and cycling flows is required. Imperial Drive traffic counts show circa 17,000 daily motor vehicle movements on a 30mph road.
- The proposals include lane widths that are between 3.25m and 4m wide – a "critical issue" in TfL's London Cycling Design Standards, on top of that, a second "critical issue" comes from simply the sheer volume of motor vehicle traffic those cycling will be expected to mix with. This is true of both the A4090 on-carriage provision and Marsh Road. A 2m advisory cycle lane is not a suitable "quieter and safer" treatment on Marsh Road between Cecil Park and West End Lane.
- The A4090 section also features non-continuous bidirectional tracks with no clarity as to how those cycling could enter and exit from them, as well as shared space directly outside a busy station – designing in conflict between those cycling and walking. At the junction with Cambridge Road, the bidirectional tracks give way to a road with wide entry/exit radii and no other apparent speed/behaviour treatments. This is likely to result in, at best, no one using the track; at worst, serious or fatal collisions – and again, this design is directly recommended against in the London Cycling Design Standards.

- Some of the residential streets (e.g. Vaughan Road, The Gardens, Northumberland Park and Cecil Park) feature high volumes and sometimes high speeds of motor vehicle traffic using them as through or “ratrun” routes. These streets require further treatment – physical separation or restrictions to through traffic on an area-wide basis – to be successfully made “quieter and safer” (especially during school pick-up and drop-off periods).

#### **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 Fails” eliminated.