

## **London Cycling Campaign response to Richmond Active Travel Strategy proposals**

*19 December 2019*

[https://haveyoursay.citizenspace.com/richmonddecs/ats/consult\\_view/](https://haveyoursay.citizenspace.com/richmonddecs/ats/consult_view/)

### **About the London Cycling Campaign**

London Cycling Campaign (LCC) is a charity with more than 20,000 supporters of whom over 11,000 are fully paid-up members. We speak up on behalf of everyone who cycles or wants to cycle in Greater London; and we speak up for a greener, healthier, happier and better-connected capital.

This response was developed with input from LCC's borough groups.

### **General comments on this scheme:**

- Richmond council's increasing focus on "active travel" is very welcome, as is this transport strategy, and indeed the focus on delivery for cycle routes and facilities proposed in it.
- However there are concerns that given the declaration of a "climate emergency" by the council, and indeed the emergency itself, this document fails to go far and fast enough in enabling active travel and reducing motor vehicle use in the borough.

### **Specific comments on this scheme:**

- The targets in the document to significantly boost active travel, largely derived it appears from TfL, are very welcome. The target to raise the proportion of residents living within 400m of the strategic cycling network from 0% currently to 15% by 2021 seems particularly demanding – and the only appropriate response will be to rapidly roll-out high-quality cycle routes to achieve it.
- The "porosity" fails to adequately identify which "cells" or areas require further treatment internally to make them viable for all ages and abilities to cycle and indeed walk in. People tend to only feel comfortable cycling in "low traffic neighbourhoods" or on main roads where there are physically protected cycle tracks. Therefore most of these cells will require significant further treatment to make crossings between them of value. Given this it is very important that low traffic neighbourhoods, main road cycle tracks *and* main road crossings are rapidly rolled out in the borough, not just one or two of those three elements.
- We do not believe the current TfL Cycleway "quality criteria" is sufficient to deliver cycle routes suitable for all ages and abilities to cycle on. Other London boroughs are already setting out strategies that commit them to exceeding this quality bar, most notably on volume of motor traffic. Richmond should also do this, in order to ensure it is delivering high-quality cycle routes. Currently the borough is arguing to avoid

even reaching TfL's criteria in some cases.

- Similarly, given the above, Richmond could and should consider further additions to the strategy to ensure it is responding in suitable urgency and ambition to the climate emergency. Nottingham's workplace parking levy should be considered, for instance, as well as road-user charging (as City of London is considering), a commitment to low traffic neighbourhood coverage (ie a percentage of residential roads within a certain number of years), and, again as an example, a target for annual car parking space provision reduction.
- The council should also consider how it tracks and reports on progress on this strategy, its delivery, climate emissions reductions etc. Given the scale of emergency and rapidity of action required, a regularly updated website of key metrics and delivery milestones should be considered.

### **General points about infrastructure schemes:**

- The Mayor's Transport Strategy relies on a growth in cycle trips to keep London moving. This means infrastructure schemes must 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 and enable all ages and abilities to cycle, 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 modes 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.
- Evidence from TfL and from many schemes in London, the UK and worldwide shows the economic benefits, including to businesses, to be found from enabling a wider range of people to cycle more. Further evidence shows how cycling schemes also benefit air quality and reduce climate changing emissions, as well as improving resident health outcomes and reducing inactivity, as mentioned above.

- 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. Above 2,000 Passenger Car Unit (PCUs) motor vehicle movements per day, or 20mph motor traffic speeds, cycling should be physically separated from motor traffic.