

London Cycling Campaign

19 January 2018

London Assembly cycling infrastructure investigation

<https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/london-assembly/london-assemblys-current-investigations/cycling-infrastructure>

This consultation response is on behalf of the London Cycling Campaign (LCC), the capital's leading cycling organisation with more than 12,000 members and 30,000 supporters. This response was developed with input from representatives of LCC's borough groups.

The London Assembly has requested answers on the following questions:

1. What progress on new cycling infrastructure has been made under Sadiq Khan, and what are his long-term plans?

The pace of physical construction thus far has been markedly slower than that achieved by Boris Johnson in the last years of his Mayoralty. This is a major concern as Sadiq Khan had pledged to London Cycling Campaign members and supporters as well as the broader public, prior to his election, to triple the mileage of protected space on main roads and complete the "Better Junctions" programme.

Some schemes have been delayed (CS11, Old Street and others), despite having passed successfully through consultation. Plus several major schemes have come forward, including ones specifically stated to cater for safe cycling, that fail to address the needs of those cycling sufficiently or at all. These include Nine Elms, Camberwell Green and Croydon Fiveways. One of the newly consulted-on Cycle Superhighways, CS4, also features a major gap in the middle of its provision, due to delays at either council or TfL level. And even among the Better/Safer Junctions schemes, such as Lambeth Bridge and Waterloo roundabout, there have been more gaps or failures in scheme designs than under the later stages of the previous administration.

On top of this, serious concerns regarding the reliability of TfL funding have been raised by several London councils – with funding apparently shifted from year to year at short notice.

Much also remains unclear as to the future, and the extent to which The Mayor and his administration prioritise main road tracks ("Cycle Superhighways"), side street routes ("Quietways"), or other approaches; and what, if any, quality bar to funding the Mayor sets for major schemes and borough funding.

More positively, funding and support for cycling infrastructure that was planned or begun during Johnson's period in office has continued, while the new Mayor has announced a doubling of the cycling budget. And several major junction redesigns, plus two new Cycle Superhighways, have come forward to public consultation since the new Mayor took office.

There is funding in the current TfL business plan for eight Cycle Superhighways, including four as-yet unnamed and likely to be aligned with corridors identified by TfL's Strategic Cycling Analysis as of the highest priority. And the Mayor has also put in funding provision for the Rotherhithe - Canary Wharf bridge.

It is clear the Mayor views air pollution, "Healthy Streets" and reducing motor traffic volumes and dominance as key to his vision for London. Conversely it is not yet clear how the Mayor intends to overcome the obstacles to rolling out new cycling infrastructure at the maximum possible rate and to a high quality bar, so as to help achieve these ambitions.

2. Has TfL resolved the problems that delayed some cycling schemes under the previous Mayor?

Not yet, as the Mayor is not currently delivering at the pace the previous Mayor did. Such problems are complex, with some elements beyond the ability of any Mayor to currently influence. However, there are many TfL-controlled roads that the Mayor should be moving forward schemes on rapidly. And there is much the Mayor could and should be doing to exert his influence on ensuring delivery moves forward more rapidly, most obviously in tying funding to quality of schemes proposed.

Factors outside direct control of the Mayor that influence the ability to deliver cycling schemes or slow delivery include: motivations and views of borough Councillors, officers and residents; legal action or threat thereof by well-resourced stakeholder organisations opposed to cycling; failure by stakeholders such as the boroughs and TfL to clearly communicate benefits of major schemes and to win over residents sufficiently.

What is clear is that if London is to embrace walking, cycling and active travel to reduce pollution, congestion and improve activity-related health, then a lot more needs to be done faster and to a higher standard (e.g. to the standard of the newer Cycle Superhighways or above in the case of physically-protected cycle tracks).

Weakening or degrading cycling schemes is certainly not the answer as this simply reduces the number of people enabled to start cycling, or cycle more, introduces risks and safety issues to schemes, and – worse of all - incentivises driving. There is ample evidence that high-quality cycling schemes, as well as schemes that appropriately restrict motor vehicle traffic, offer more benefits than those schemes that fail to either restrict motor vehicle traffic or offer a high-quality cycling environment.

There is also evidence that a properly-planned network of high-quality cycle routes is the single biggest factor in enabling cycling to become a mainstream mode of transport. It is vital, then, that high-quality cycling schemes come forward more rapidly than so far.

3. Has segregation delivered the anticipated benefits on the Cycle Superhighways? How many cyclists are using these routes?

Yes, and lots. TfL has extensive detail and data on this (see, for instance, <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/pic-161130-07-cycle-quietways.pdf> showing initial levels of usage for newer Cycle Superhighways, <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/travel-in-london-report-10.pdf> showing high

levels of growth, particularly in central London where infrastructure is clustered and <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/attitudes-to-cycling-2016.pdf> showing that route improvements help people cycle more). There is a growing body of evidence that shows benefits not just for cycling, but also walking and the wider environment. But it would be sensible to make several further points:

- Demonstrably, there is a high correlation between the quality of the Cycle Superhighways (perception of safety, separation of cycling from motor vehicles at junctions and on links, track width, comfort, convenience, delay at signals etc.) and their use, both in terms of overall numbers of those using each route, but also in terms of the proportion of people who actively choose to comply with and utilise track and junction designs over cycling in the road or ignoring cycle-specific signals. In other words, build high-quality segregated cycle infrastructure and lots of cyclists use the tracks rather than the road or parallel routes.

- The majority of those using the Cycle Superhighways currently appear to be doing so for commuting (see <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/pic-161130-07-cycle-quietways.pdf> on usage patterns). But the Strategic Cycling Analysis predicts growth in shorter commuting and other types of trips (<http://content.tfl.gov.uk/strategic-cycling-analysis.pdf>). A continuous network of safe-feeling, comfortable and direct routes without significant gaps and linking together will be required to enable a far higher and wider range of types of cycling journeys and distances (see further work on international best practice <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/international-cycling-infrastructure-best-practice-study.pdf>). This network will likely be formed of a mix of approaches, including physically separated tracks on main roads. But it must feel continuously comfortable and safe to use and route many more people from door to door – hence the Mayor’s ambition that by 2041, 70% of Londoners will live within 400m of a safe and high-quality cycle route.

4. To what extent has segregation had negative consequences for other road users and, if necessary, how can this be mitigated?

It simply hasn’t, certainly not to the extent that is claimed by some commentators, who assert that, by taking road space from motor traffic, protected cycle tracks have caused significantly increased congestion (across London). TfL’s analysis shows this isn’t the case (<http://content.tfl.gov.uk/pic-161130-07-cycle-quietways.pdf>).

Two simple concepts define traffic management in London and most other dense urban cities – traffic evaporation and induced demand.

It has been established that in general, attempts to alleviate motor traffic congestion locally or regionally simply generate more motor traffic trips: road widening, junction capacity and similar schemes result in shorter journey times for the short term, but this incentivises more people to make that journey in a motor vehicle, and hence over time traffic speeds, journey times and congestion levels return to where they were before. This is the well-researched effect of “induced demand”. Particularly within dense and space-constrained cities, creating more motor capacity in general just induces more trips by motor vehicle.

On the other side of the coin, when motor traffic is restricted, some of it (circa 15% for most major schemes) “evaporates”. For major restrictions in motor traffic – such as reductions of lanes or closures of roads to motor traffic – this typically means most current motor vehicle journeys switch to other routes, but via the same mode; but a significant portion “evaporate”, with the journey either not happening at all, or being made by alternative means, or at different times, or rerouting entirely out of the study area and away from nearby alternative routes.

Congestion overall is incredibly unlikely to have been significantly increased by the arrival of less than a handful of Cycle Superhighways featuring segregation, on less than 1% of London’s roads. TfL, the Mayor and indeed London Assembly Transport Committee have already seen copious evidence that congestion is primarily caused by unnecessary motor vehicle journeys.

On a local basis, removing motor vehicle lanes on the Embankment for instance, will have caused minor congestion impacts – primarily to those vehicles unable to reroute. These will have been felt most during construction and in the initial months after the scheme bedded in. But overall, London’s congestion is again primarily caused by unnecessary motor vehicle journeys and the impact of the Cycle Superhighways will be insignificant to network congestion and capacity.

The evidence from other cities is that over time, as more and more space is reallocated from private motor vehicles to cycling (and walking) and more people are enabled to cycle, even localised impacts of the Cycle Superhighways are likely to decrease. And overall, significant congestion reductions could be realised. That is not to say average private motor vehicle speeds are likely to go up. But more likely fewer people will drive in private motor vehicles, taxis and private hire vehicles and more people will either cycle, walk or use public transport – so the network overall will be more efficient.

This is already visible on a localised level as the arrival of the Cycle Superhighways means the roads they are on now move more people than ever before (the N-S and E-W Cycle Superhighways were moving 5% more people than ever within two weeks of opening, <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/pic-161130-07-cycle-quietways.pdf>). And, as well as moving people more efficiently, the recent Cycle Superhighways also improve the pedestrian environment and crossings – thus making walking more attractive and less hazardous. And, needless to say, more walking and cycling also results in improved public health.

Further, turning back to traffic evaporation and induced demand, in an already highly-dense city that is growing in population (but not space), there are few alternatives available. Even putting aside pollution, inactivity and climate change, on a simple efficient transport basis, space for private motor vehicles is one of the least efficient approaches for moving people and goods around a city, whereas space for cycling is one of the most efficient.

This situation will also not be alleviated by autonomous or electric motor vehicles (nor any combination thereof). The former will still cause problems with inactivity, climate change, pollution and risk, under certain conditions, creating very hostile streetscapes with the pedestrian and cycling environment significantly degraded – if car manufacturers promoting autonomous solutions that seek to place the onus of safe behaviour on pedestrians and cyclists win out, for instance; whereas

the latter, whilst reducing air pollution and mitigating climate change (if powered by renewable sources), will not improve congestion or inactivity.

The only answer to London's congestion problem is to get far more people out of cars and onto alternatives. Due to limited capacity on buses and limited ability to increase tube capacity rapidly enough to meet the growing population, segregated cycle tracks on main roads are one of the few proven, well-evidenced answers to London's issues. And indeed, many of the problems deemed to be associated with them are primarily due to their slow roll-out in terms of construction and into becoming a coherent network.

Concerns about cycle tracks have understandably been raised by groups representing visually impaired and mobility-impaired people. This view should be taken very seriously – and it is clear that some people with such disabilities struggle to deal with the Cycle Superhighways and seek to avoid them. Overall however, the data and evidence TfL has collected (for instance via its Bus Stop Bypass Working Group) shows that people with such impairments are not put at increased risk or discomfort when crossing or walking near the Cycle Superhighways and other cycling infrastructure .

On top of this, while the Cycle Superhighways have been primarily trumpeted as infrastructure that is positive for cycling, it has been repeatedly pointed out (for instance by previous Cycling Commissioner Andrew Gilligan) that each scheme has enhanced the pedestrian environment also – with improved crossings, tactile treatments for crossing the Superhighways and often wider pavements. Where the Cycle Superhighways are potentially negative for pedestrians is where they have primarily taken away pavement space instead of road space. This is due to TfL giving greater weight to its modelled impact on buses and private motor vehicles than concerns over reduced pedestrian space. LCC would always see carriageway space taken for cycling schemes before pavement space. And such an approach would now align closely with the Mayor's.

5. Have Quietways delivered their anticipated benefits? How many cyclists are using them?

No. And far fewer than are using Cycle Superhighways.

Quietway 1 is the only one that has seen usage figures publicly released, and it has seen a significant rate of growth in cycling – of a similar rate of increase to the East-West and North-South Cycle Superhighway. However, the volume of cyclists using Quietway 1 is far lower than the volume using either of the main segregated Cycle Superhighways – which carry roughly ten times more cyclists.

Quietway 1 is also commonly held (in conversation with borough officers, TfL officers, transport experts and consultants etc.) to be the flagship Quietway. Other Quietways being brought forward and in construction currently feature nowhere near the quality of continuous route, junction treatment or overall approach of Quietway 1.

Even Quietway 1 still features significant gaps in provision where appropriate and safe facilities disappear or are not present (yet, in some cases). The Quietways programme has often been pitched to two different audiences very differently, and this is probably the primary explanation for why they are failing: to the general public, they have been described as enabling those who are less confident

to cycle; to boroughs they have been described as low cost solutions with low levels of interventions required.

TfL has funded schemes, and Sustrans has been commissioned to design them, on the basis largely of what boroughs are willing to put in. This is clearly visible on most Quietway routes – where the level and types of infrastructure installed change from borough to borough. Boroughs with less understanding of cycling, or willingness to provide for it, simply produce worse Quietway sections – seeking to provide the lowest level of intervention possible with the least effect on private motor vehicle provision (parking, access, speed, volume etc.).

On top of that, Quietway schemes are clearly prey to the same borough-by-borough issues other cycling schemes can suffer from – whereby boroughs which do not sufficiently prioritise cycling, or where councillors are not robust in championing cycling schemes, often rapidly weaken or remove sections of or entire cycling schemes in response to even relatively small amounts of pressure from some residents.

The unfortunate result is that there is not a single Quietway that could accurately be described as coherent, safe-feeling and continuous enough to genuinely enable many people who are less confident about cycling to start cycling. And there are less than a handful of sections of Quietway even within a single borough that could pass that test either.

If Quietways are to fulfil their potential and are to genuinely enable far more people to cycle, including those currently not confident enough to ride on busier roads, then all London stakeholders must start working to a minimum scheme standard that genuinely delivers coherent, continuous, direct and safe-feeling routes – as the Cycle Superhighways have (largely, and lately) done.

It is worth also highlighting the “Central London Cycling Grid” for consideration in this section. The Grid was meant to be the densest and most complete section of the previous Mayor’s cycling plans, with his aim that the majority would be delivered before he left. The Grid is currently due for completion by 2019, but the network is of far lower quality than was originally suggested for two reasons.

In the original consultation 25% of the Grid was to be Superhighways and 75% Quietways. It was clearly suggested that existing Superhighways within the area would be upgraded to make them “largely segregated or traffic-free” but few such upgrades have occurred (beyond CS2 and where CS7 meets CS3 and CS6). And a later map showing routes expected to be complete by December 2016 postponed sections running along the Westway for the East-West Superhighway and from London Bridge for CS4 (CS4 has gone to public consultation without this element). Further to that map, CS5 has never been progressed into a route further north than just past Vauxhall Bridge. As a consequence, there is now a much higher dependence on Quietway routes in the Grid area than originally planned.

Quietways within the Grid have largely not been designed to reduce motor vehicle traffic on them. The Grid sections, as with many other Quietway sections, also favour mainly paint and signs over

physical separation or motor traffic reduction on busy roads – and thus they fail to make cycling appealing and/or safe.

6. What are the differences in infrastructure between inner and outer London? How can TfL ensure infrastructure in different areas is sufficient and appropriate to the location?

All of London urgently requires cycling infrastructure, built to a high-quality. As TfL's Strategic Cycling Analysis shows (SCA, see 7, below), there are very few places in London that don't feature high potential to increase cycling levels.

Thus far much of London's cycling has been characterised by commuters – the fast, fit and fearless is the cliché that defines our cycling community because that's what is required to cycle in most of London. Radial commuter cycling routes have therefore offered the greatest opportunity to deliver safety gains and increase cycling numbers by attracting those who were already cycling but seeking a safer route, those cycling irregularly, and those who felt close to cycling.

The SCA demonstrates there is still a high potential to grow cycling using radial Cycle Superhighway-style commuter routes through inner and central London. However, from the Dutch experience and expertise, and from international data on cycling journeys, we can see that across the globe, average walking journeys drop off sharply above 2km distance; similarly cycling journeys reduce after 6km. So these distances are the primary radii London should plan for with regard to infrastructure for these modes in the medium term.

The SCA should be used as the primary tool for assessing likely cycling infrastructure interventions in both inner and outer London – it will help determine both the routing and likely style of route/infrastructure applied (Cycle Superhighway, Quietway, "low traffic neighbourhood" etc.). However, it is also likely that cycling infrastructure in inner and outer London will, for the medium term, differ significantly: in inner London, planned infrastructure will primarily be characterised by high-flow commuter routes radiating in towards central London; in outer London, cycling infrastructure will be primarily characterised by radial routes radiating outwards in all direction from major town centres, amenities, transport interchanges etc.

The actual approach taken or tools used will often be very similar – routes should be direct and high-quality, with inner London ones designed to take higher flows. But whether these routes go along a main road on a cycle track, a very quiet side street, through a "low traffic neighbourhood" or "modal filter cell" or via some other approach is less relevant. Every route must be continuous, built with enough capacity, and feel safe along its entire length, with the aim to deliver a dense network of cycle-friendly streets.

It is also very important to note that further developments in technology such as e-bikes may enable far more people to ride further than 6km, and this is already becoming apparent in European cities (where, incidentally, e-cycles are often the fastest growing market according to industry sources). But radial routes to transport interchanges, town centres etc. will still remain key even if e-bikes increase viable travel distance by cycle.

7. How will TfL's new 'Strategic Cycling Analysis' help determine where and how to invest in infrastructure?

The Strategic Cycling Analysis is not a perfect tool – but it is the best tool seen yet for identifying the areas, corridors and routes that offer the highest potential growth in cycling, and therefore where infrastructure interventions should be located as a priority.

Funding for TfL and borough schemes should be tied to fulfilling the Mayor's Transport Strategy, to a high minimum quality bar, and to the SCA.

The SCA clearly also shows that space for cycling must be given priority over space for motor vehicles if cycling interventions are to succeed. To fulfil much of the potential outlined on the SCA will require building cycle tracks on main roads and the "strategic road network"; as the SCA shows, many of the highest potential routes are simply not co-located with appropriate parallel quiet routes as alternative provision; and often the main road routes do not have enough width to feature multiple lanes of private motor vehicle traffic, bus lanes and safe cycle routes. Thus it is inevitable that private motor vehicle lanes will have to be increasingly impacted on (as, indeed, may some bus lanes) to fulfil the potential for cycling.

It should also be noted that while some might claim the SCA holds few surprises, it does clearly demonstrate to those boroughs where councillors say (as many do) that no one will ever cycle there, that the reverse is true - provided appropriate infrastructure is built to enable them to.

8. How appropriate is the 400-metre target set in the draft Transport Strategy? Can we equate proximity with access?

Very appropriate, but proximity of a route alone is not "access". The 400m target is not just based on TfL's excellent London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS), but also the Dutch CROW manual. Both of these documents are highly respected by transport experts as imparting good design guidance on the basis of solid evidence.

That said, according to both CROW and LCDS 400m should be the upper limit for the "mesh spacing," or the distance between two cycle routes going east-west or north-south in a network; instead the Mayor's target implies a mesh of 800m. LCDS and CROW also recommend designing for much lower mesh sizes in the centres of cities – down to 250m and even 150m between routes.

The Mayor's target is for 70% of residents to live within 400m of a "safe" and "high-quality" route. However he has yet to define what either of these terms mean in use. This definition must happen, or councils that are hostile to cycling will be able to claim they have met such a target within their interpretation of "safe" and "high quality".

LCC's view is that both are effectively represented by a scheme which scores 70% or more on TfL's Cycling Level of Service (CLOS) system with no "critical issues" (both taken, as per CLOS guidance, at the weakest points in the scheme), and one where the daily motor vehicle flows are below 2,000 PCUs and 20mph or where physical separation is provided (again, this applies along the length of the entire route).

It is reasonably safe to assume - based on the experience of other cities that have achieved mass cycling levels - that proximity to a network of truly safe, high-quality routes will correlate strongly with both use and access. But of course that's not the full story.

There are many barriers to cycling that require other approaches on top of infrastructure – designing for disability-adapted cycles, effective marketing, smart user road pricing, better cycle parking location and standards, promotion of cargo, e-bikes etc. – but these are all fundamentally secondary to providing that mesh, or network, of high-quality safe routes with proximity to start and end points for many journeys.

9. Is TfL's approach to public engagement working effectively to improve scheme designs and meet stakeholder needs?

Yes, but not as effectively as it could be.

It is important that all stakeholders are afforded a fair chance to air their opinions. TfL has a difficult job in taking a proportionate and reasonable decision, balancing any potential local opposition to design schemes with their wider intended benefits. Moreover we recognise that occasionally some people will be inconvenienced by implementation of schemes that are necessary to achieve public policy goals, for example the targets set in the Mayor's Transport Strategy and objectives of the London Plan. However, there are occasions where elements of opposition are based on highly questionable evidence or simple fear of change.

TfL must be sensitive in handling this, but decisive in achieving the quality and scale of cycling infrastructure that is necessary. Unfortunately the opposite has too often been true, leading to excessive and self-defeating weakening of far too many schemes.

Conversely, the same approach too often fails to listen to or appropriately deal with those genuinely defensible concerns that are raised – leading to expertise and ideas lost, primarily because schemes are far too advanced by the time they reach the stage of public engagement and/or consultation.

It is vital that expert and stakeholder responses which raise serious concerns about the scheme are dealt with in a more constructive manner, ideally at a far earlier stage than at present, i.e. before most opportunities to alter or redesign schemes are lost. The current approach is at best, to provide minor tweaks to schemes, but most often to provide very brief and dismissive responses to major, well-evidenced concerns about the scheme. Instead, far more schemes should be discussed in public and with stakeholders prior to traffic modelling, detailed design etc. – and this conversation should be evidence-based, but robust, with real possibility to alter the scheme. A second, more technical consultation could then be run later on traffic (modelling) impacts, detailed design tweaks etc.

LCC and Living Streets' briefing document on "low-traffic neighbourhoods" has more pointers. In brief, our experience - and that of many officers in boroughs and TfL, as well as external consultants – tells us that TfL could do several things far better to enable more schemes to come forward more rapidly, and without as much controversy or "bikelash":

- More political leadership is required, particularly at borough level – with councillors and officers needing to be not just brought on board with the Mayor’s vision for London and its transport systems, but also to enable political leaders and their officers to make tough decisions and do far better jobs at engaging with their residents and stakeholders.

- A broader, earlier and more robust conversation is needed between City Hall, TfL and key stakeholders. Too many bodies representing specific interests on a local and regional basis, businesses and business representative bodies, large developers, employers and indeed the boroughs themselves, often fail to understand the advantages cycling and cycling schemes offer those they represent, and worse, often oppose schemes on the basis of fear based on incorrect information or simply fear of change. A classic and common example of this is retail businesses along proposed cycle routes opposing loss of car parking – often such opposition is ill-informed (businesses aren’t losing the parking they think they are, or the spaces they have are not used in the manner they think they are), but very loudly stated – and this can derail schemes easily.

- More should be done to communicate schemes and their benefits (and disbenefits) clearly and early. The aim should be for consultation to be a genuine conversation – whereby those raising concerns are answered and their concerns acted on where sensible issues emerge, but also where the cornerstones and principles of a scheme are accurately identified and articulated early on, and referred to and discussed confidently throughout. At present, TfL (and most borough) consultations simply cannot be characterised in this manner. Instead, the consultation nearly always happens when plans are already very advanced and at a detailed stage – with stakeholders on all sides not “listened” to but told what minor tweaks to a scheme might be done in response to issues raised.

- Consultation approval numbers should also not be treated as a referendum – rather as a guide to what issues and concerns should be given most attention. In other words, if a scheme is likely to help deliver on the Mayor’s aims and objectives, a scheme should not necessarily be derailed if a majority of respondents do not approve it, and vice versa.

- It is also increasingly important that TfL is able to engage in a far more constructive relationship with boroughs. At present, from an external perspective, it appears boroughs have extensive ability to weaken or even destroy cycling schemes if they wish to, yet at the same time, it is clear boroughs feel very dictated to by TfL. This is not a healthy way to plan cycle schemes in London.

10. Are Londoners sufficiently aware of the cycling infrastructure available to them, and how can awareness be increased?

Increasing awareness of routes and infrastructure via promotion is of worth, but infrastructure should generally precede promotion. When good cycle infrastructure is available to people, more people cycle, and it is easier to change people’s behaviour to start cycling or cycle more. Once good infrastructure is in place in an area, then promotion of cycling, including marketing, behaviour change, incentives for cycling (and not driving), promotion of inclusive cycling etc. is far more likely to yield better results.

Given this, the primary requirement here is to ensure that once high-quality cycling infrastructure is provided in an area, then the infrastructure is appropriately promoted. In several boroughs, we have seen successful promotion techniques going beyond just press releases and social media to include, for instance, loans of a wide range of cycle types to interested individuals and businesses – cargo cycles, e-assist cycles, adapted cycles etc.

11. How is TfL using infrastructure to attract a more diverse range of people to cycle in London?

We know from studies such as the “Near Miss Project” that women tend to be more heavily affected by the feeling of safety, or lack thereof, cycling on our streets

(<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214140515002236>). We also know from the experience of other cities that have far higher modal shares for cycling that as more and better safe-feeling cycle infrastructure is provided, a more diverse range of people start cycling.

It is therefore vital, if we are to increase the diversity of those cycling in London that we plan for and provide truly safe-feeling cycle infrastructure. Infrastructure that features gaps, is of low quality etc. simply will not attract a wider range of people to cycling.

It should also be noted that tools such as the SCA do not fully capture the range of journey types, start and destination points etc. a wider range of people would do if they were enabled to cycle. Therefore it’s vital that the SCA is further improved progressively to incorporate such information as more and better data becomes available, and that planning for cycling in general further considers the different types of journeys (including multi-modal journeys for instance) that might be favoured by a wider range of people than currently cycle, and also a wider range of cycles too – from e-assist cycles to wider adapted and cargo etc. bikes, dockless hire etc.

12. Is there sufficient cycle parking in London, and is it in the right locations?

No and no.

There are copious examples of locations all over London where, for a variety of reasons, it is possible to see either cycle demand suppressed by a lack of cycle parking (often among other factors), or where cycle parking supply is already hugely outstripped by demand. (There are also some examples of underused cycle parking too, but usually this parking is simply located in the wrong location, and/or other factors are also suppressing cycle demand – such as lack of nearby safe cycling infrastructure.) And this issue is just going to get worse.

Given the previous cycling modal share target of 5% by 2026 and cycle parking targets of approx. 20,000 spaces a year, it’s likely that the demand for cycle parking will greatly exceed supply (both at home and at destinations), by the time that mode share target is reached. On top of this, the rise of dockless cycle hire in London will likely further increase pressure on cycle parking locations unless all operators operate to industry standards now being developed.

Cycle parking has a long history of being, at best, an afterthought for new road schemes, urban planning and developers. Even despite the London Plan (only amended to provide for improved cycle parking levels in 2016) it is still common to see poor quality cycle parking designed late in the

process of major development and urban planning schemes – with common mistakes including too little parking, parking sited poorly, parking in isolated locations, poor access to parking and poor quality on-street and secure cycle parking design (stand designs, placement, spacing). There are also obviously those boroughs who, for a variety of reasons, fail to provide cycle parking where it is most wanted and needed. The result is parking of bicycles chained to street furniture which may offer less security and is often prohibited. Such overflow parking is a very likely an indication of demand and can be addressed by increased cycle-stand provision.

It is notable that the recent removal of street railings along many stretches of road has had the effect of reducing cycle parking that was relatively secure and un-obstructive. In some cases cycle stands have been erected to replace railing parking, or street furniture retrofitted with cycle-hoops, but in many cases there has not been alternative provision putting additional pressure on existing bike stands (and three or more bikes attached to a stand designed for two can cause an obstruction or lead to difficult bike retrieval). In all cases of railing removal, where it is clear that they are used for cycle parking (e.g. near stations, shops or workplaces), local authorities should prioritise additional bike stands.

Cycle parking also needs regular supervision, inspection and management. Where cycle parking is not being managed sensibly abandoned bikes often reduce the effective spaces available and the attractiveness of cycle parking both for users and non-users. All cycle parking should be regularly monitored to regularly check for abandoned bikes and with periodic comprehensive surveys to track growth in usage and identify issues of insufficient capacity in wider areas. In addition, surveys of overflow parking provides useful data on areas where cycle parking is insufficient.

Network Rail and the role of rail stations must be specifically noted in this section – most rail stations still feature far too little cycle parking of far too low quality, throughout London and beyond. And the organisations that run our rail stations are still far too slow in providing appropriate quality and quantity of cycle parking, often failing to match current demand, let alone provide for predicted and/or potential growth of cycling.

13. How are the lessons of the Mini-Hollands and other previous cycling schemes being applied elsewhere?

There are many lessons, an entire book's worth, to be taken from the three mini-Holland schemes, as well as many more lessons from the Cycle Superhighways and Quietways, from international alternative approaches, from other UK cities etc.

To deal specifically, and as briefly as possible, with the mini-Hollands, the lessons that could and should have been learnt, and the extent to which they have been learnt is as follows:

- Engage early, engage confidently, show political leadership, be clear in the rationale for major transformational schemes, but have a proper conversation with residents and stakeholders (see above). This lesson is being distributed, learnt, and improved on in a very patchwork manner across TfL and the boroughs.

- There's little point giving lots of money to boroughs that have little political will to deliver transformational change and/or major cycling schemes. There is some talk at TfL and in City Hall of improving the attitude of such boroughs, even of the need to provide some funding for such boroughs to entice them to change, but little sign that there is the appetite yet to not fund those schemes and boroughs that fall too far below a quality bar. The result is far too many weak schemes that fail fundamentally to provide for cycling appropriately in a way that will help deliver the changes needed for the Mayor to fulfil his aims in the Transport Strategy. Schemes that are likely to decrease cycling rates and even increase driving rates are still coming forward and being funded.

- Schemes that create a network of cycling routes and quiet residential and/or shopping areas around a town centre dramatically boost walking and cycling rates, can reduce motor traffic volumes locally and offer amazingly good value-for-money transport spending. Most boroughs are still far from understanding the kind of holistic approach Waltham Forest has managed. And although there are promising signs that some boroughs are beginning to absorb the lessons from the mini-Holland exemplar schemes, this appears to have mostly come from campaigning stakeholder organisations such as LCC's Borough Groups, keen councillors and/or tours given by our Borough Groups, rather than a concerted and clear communication effort from City Hall or TfL.

- High-quality cycling schemes almost invariably mean reducing motor vehicle traffic capacity. There are several lower-quality mini-Holland schemes that stand as a salutary lesson in demonstrating what happens when a borough tries to please motorists and cyclists simultaneously.

- The "bikelash" dies away. Many boroughs and too many people at City Hall and TfL are too scared of the "bikelash". But the experience in Enfield and Waltham Forest is that if schemes are good, political will is determined, and communications are good, the bikelash can not only be survived, but that over time, most of those who initially raise opposition or concerns are won over.

- The mini-Holland boroughs with the political will and ambition to deliver high-quality schemes have delivered, against strong opposition, popular and high-quality schemes that show what boroughs in outer London can achieve if appropriately funded, are delivering increasing cycling and walking rates and should be studied as benchmarks going forward for other boroughs and TfL (particularly Waltham Forest's "villagisation", town centre and Lea Bridge Road schemes, and Enfield's main road semi-segregated schemes).

14. Should cycling infrastructure be oriented toward longer-distance commuting journeys, or more localised trips?

Both. See answer above regarding inner and outer London.

15. LCC's infrastructure consultation responses all carry the text below. It is worth repeating here as it covers key quality indicators for cycling infrastructure.

- 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.