

# Central London Grid

## Response to TfL Consultation

February 2014

LONDON  
CYCLING  
CAMPAIGN



### Summary: Three Key Tests for the Central London Grid

London Cycling Campaign thanks the Mayor's Office and Transport for London for the opportunity to comment on plans for a new Central London Grid to promote cycling. Our detailed comments are provided in subsequent sections.

The Central London Grid (CLG) is a hugely important and exciting project. Originally conceived by the London Cycling Campaign in 2009, and now being backed and developed by Mayor Boris Johnson in partnership with central London boroughs, the CLG is both literally and figuratively at the heart of the Mayor's Vision for Cycling in London.

LCC congratulated the Mayor at the time of the Vision's publication for its ground-breaking ambition and its defined, funded, programmes to support cycling; we also praised him for starting to make good his promises to the tens of thousands of Londoners who supported LCC's *Love London, Go Dutch* campaign. In the same way as the Vision's 'Mini-Hollands' should prove the case that the immense potential for cycling in Outer London can be unlocked so too should the CLG be transformative in cementing London's position as a world class city in which to live, work, do business and spend leisure time.

Indeed, thanks to the Mayor London already has an iconic, world class Cycle Hire scheme; as LCC said at the time, what better than to also create a high quality environment for cycling within the centre for those who use it? A centre that can be safely and easily traversed by bike is also what increasing numbers of businesses in London want to see happen, for the benefit of their workers and to attract new international talent to the capital. The hire bikes have become a major selling point for London; so too can be the CLG.

A high quality CLG is also essential as central hub that will connect the Cycle Superhighways, and from which improved facilitation for cycling can be built outwards. Those who arrive in central London on the superhighways (which the Mayor has also promised will be upgraded to the highest standards) deserve not to be cast adrift in what is often a hostile and sometimes hazardous environment for cycling. It is only fair that instead they are able to continue their journeys safely, enjoyably and directly to their ultimate destinations. Done well, the CLG will enable this.

The key tests of TfL's current CLG proposals can be summarised as follows:

1. Convenience: does the CLG as currently envisaged provide a convenient network, such that any journey that a member of the public might wish to make within the centre can be made easily and directly by bike?
2. Quality: is the planned quality of provision suitable for cyclists of all ages and abilities, as it should be?
3. Capacity: does it provide enough capacity to not only better facilitate existing cycling levels but unlock cycling's potential to be the transport mode of choice in the centre (after walking)?

In examining TfL's CLG proposals LCC has come to the conclusion that whilst they have much to commend them, they also fall short in a number of ways, most notably in respect to: (a) the insufficient coverage, continuity and directness of the planned network; and (b) the lack of confirmation of quality and capacity standards. As a result LCC is still giving our backing to the Mayor for the CLG, but calling on him – *as well the boroughs involved* - to guarantee that:

1. **The pre-2016 phase of the CLG will provide a coherent (albeit initially coarse-grained) cycle network for central London. This will provide the basis for a subsequent and rapid increase in the density of routes during the early years of the next mayoralty to create a centre that is easily and safely navigable by bike throughout.**
2. **The highest quality of provision will be adopted as standard from the outset, with cyclists benefitting from physically separated lanes where motor traffic speeds are greater than 20 mph or volumes are higher than 2,000 PCU/day (as is the standard for urban spaces in the Netherlands).**
3. **The CLG will have sufficient capacity to enable cycling to become the prime means of typical journeys in central London (after walking). The pre-2016 CLG must have capacity that is consistent with this objective.**

Local politicians also have a vital role to play. Political will is the key ingredient to enabling Londoners to enjoy streets that are as “safe and inviting for cycling as they are in Holland” – as promised to LCC’s supporters by the Mayor - but displaying such will is not just the responsibility of him alone. It is an oft-cited fact that 95% of London’s roads are not with the City Hall/TfL’s control and it is therefore transparent that London’s Boroughs have an equal responsibility to make cycling safe and enjoyable for all. In the case of the CLG the boroughs involved will be held to account by Londoners in the same way as the Mayor for the level of political will and ambition they show.

It is therefore hugely encouraging that the boroughs are working in partnership with each other and City Hall to create the CLG; it hasn’t always been obvious in the past that such partnership would have been welcomed by many parties and this a very good start. But it is clear that there is much more that some boroughs can and should do (and in this regard it is very disappointing that LB Tower Hamlets is not present at the table).

The concerns – at times objections - of local residents must of course be taken seriously, but at the same time no progress is ever challenge-free. Those boroughs which are currently withholding approval for CLG plans at critical locations must look to the bigger and wider picture, engage their residents, and if necessary take some political risks in support of the project – after all, the CLG will ultimately be hugely good for the quality of life for everyone in central London.

To this we can add the Royal Parks whose co-operation will be essential if the CLG is not to be blighted by major discontinuities within an otherwise high quality network. The Royal Parks appear to be similarly withholding consent at certain locations, apparently because of unfounded concerns about pedestrian safety and comfort.

**LCC therefore calls on all the boroughs concerned and the Royal Parks to ensure that they do not block progress at key nodes and links within the CLG. The same leadership qualities are expected of them as of City Hall, and large numbers of Londoners will similarly back them too when they make hard choices to support cycling.**

In summary, it is vitally important that by the time Mayor Boris Johnson comes to the end of his current term of office in 2016, the unprecedented funding allocated in his Vision for Cycling for flagship programmes such as the CLG is spent, and spent well. The CLG must by that time offer high quality infrastructure and facilitation for cycling that is being used and valued by the swelling number of Londoners and visitors to our city who cycle in central London, as well as the many more who wish to do so but are deterred by the dangers they face. The Mayor will undoubtedly want to be remembered not just for having a Vision for Cycling, but for delivering it. Improving the current CLG plans as LCC has described will be a quintessential part of this delivery. The boroughs and Royal Parks must also recognise the public support that exists for a high quality CLG, and do more to play their full role in achieving it.

Ashok Sinha  
Chief Executive

# **1. Comments on the Overall Vision**

## **1.1 Guiding Principles**

LCC welcomes the principle of a network of cycle friendly streets in central London, and we welcome the fact the central London boroughs, together with the Canals and Rivers Trust and the Royal Parks are, at long last, around a table and discussing how to implement such a network

However, while we welcome the aim of a cycle – friendly route network we consider the proposal submitted for consultation needs significant revision and strengthening to meet the needs of London’s present and future cyclists. It is vital that all boroughs and authorities rally behind the common purpose of making London a better city through this programme and that the network has no incomplete sections or barriers to completion.

In particular we want a basic (coarse grained) but coherent, direct, safe and legible network in place by 2015 with the capacity and structure to build into a more comprehensive network shortly thereafter. Conditional on political will from both the Mayor and Borough leaders, we believe this to be a realistic and achievable goal especially given the recent reductions in motor traffic in central London, and the continued growth in demand for sustainable transport by London’s rising population.

We share the Mayor’s view that ‘More cycling is better for everyone’ with the obvious benefits of reduced pollution and better health as cited in the consultation document. The Grid, as a concept originally developed by LCC, sought to provide routes that would enhance urban liveability for all Londoners by reducing the dominance of motor traffic. We want the guiding principles used by LCC of creating comfortable, attractive, cross-borough, universally accessible and well linked routes, where through motor-traffic is eliminated, minimised or separated, to underpin the Grid programme.

## **1.2 LCC’s Vision**

LCC’s vision of the central Grid, developed, in 2009 was a response to the Mayoral commitment to the Cycle Hire Scheme in zone one and the series of Cycle Superhighways which, in large part, ended at the borders of zone one. The many new and existing cyclists entering, or using, zone one need safe and convenient passage across the inner ring road and through some of the most densely trafficked zones in the capital.

As an initial step LCC identified a significant number of filtered permeability, and other, measures in zone one which, if addressed, could quickly and affordably contribute to improving conditions. Following further research LCC members developed a network, or Grid, of cycle and pedestrian friendly routes in central London.

Our aim is to create a network that is coherent, legible, convenient and quick to implement. We also seek to take advantage of the many attractive routes in central London that pass green squares and parks. Such green routes are undoubtedly favoured by cyclists and are also attractive to pedestrians when through motor traffic can be diverted away from them.

At the heart of our vision is a complete, high quality and easily navigable network that makes full use of low cost permeability measures, serving all cyclists and pedestrians and making best use of green spaces. The routes chosen are two-way which helps navigation and clarity and also are designed to provide safe crossings of the inner ring road.

We believe the same principles must underpin the Mayor’s proposals. While a significant number of the routes in the Mayor’s proposal coincide with those suggested by LCC they do not build into the coherent and attractive network that we propose.

## **1.3 A ‘Coarse Grained’ Network by 2015**

LCC wants to see rapid completion of a coarse grained Grid network. Our proposed network has been designed with rapid delivery, and practicality, in mind, as well as integration with routes beyond zones one and the potential for a finer network. While our network aims for a density of 300-400 metres between routes we note the Dutch aim for a network that is 250 meters in density. We are proposing a Grid of 6x7 minimum and 9x9 maximum at this stage. We believe such a Grid can be delivered in 12 months and that supporting links, including Quietways, should be delivered in 2 years. See accompanying map of LCC proposed coarse network routes. [LCC Grid Proposal 2014.jpg ]



We believe that the “network benefit” of a well-designed, coarse-grained Grid, delivered as a priority far outweighs any alternative benefits from a piecemeal approach. Indeed it was the piecemeal implementation of links and poor connectivity that previous failed projects such as the London Cycle Network+.

LCC recognises that adjustments to our original proposals were required in the light of changes since 2010, notably the commitment to a segregated cycle route along the embankment and along the Elephant and Castle to King’s Cross axis, as well as changes in traffic movements in the West End.

We also recognise that some very popular existing cycling routes must be upgraded to make them safe and inviting for all users.

#### **1.4 High volume Priority Cycle Routes**

We note and welcome TfL’s proposal for a filtered cycle priority route along Old St- Clerkenwell Road – Theobalds Road. As the data shows this route is already dominated by cycle users at peak times. It is not the only such route in London: Shoreditch – Bishopsgate-Borough and The Strand-Aldwych are other examples of routes that attract very high cycling numbers, despite inhospitable conditions, because there are no viable alternatives.

These routes are unavoidable for cyclists in Central London, yet cannot be considered ‘Quietways’. They must be addressed by TfL and the Mayor with a dedicated funding stream. They will require greater intervention to meet continental standards. Old St-Clerkenwell, Theobalds Road, which helps to fill a gap in the Grid, should serve as a pilot programme for other such routes.

#### **1.5 Standards**

Standards to be adopted on the Grid routes have not been specified by TfL. Indeed the consultation document suggests that little intervention will be needed – such an approach may have deterred boroughs from choosing the most appropriate routes. Selecting routes on the grounds that minimal intervention is preferred, will not deliver the network that is required.

The standards adopted for the Grid must be consistent and offer both high quality and universal access.

LCC wants our general principles for cycle route design to be incorporated in the design of all the Grid routes that will serve the many thousands of cyclists who travel in central London. These principles, which we want to see included in the forthcoming edition of the London Cycle Design Standards (LCDS), are:

- Where motor traffic volumes exceed 2000 passenger car units (pcus) per day, or 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed limits exceed 20 mph, there should either be a commensurate reduction in motor traffic speeds and traffic volumes or provision of protected space for cycling (e.g. segregated cycle lanes).
- Cycle facilities must be designed to be universal, that is: to cater for both fast and slow cyclists as well as those who are younger or older.
- Lane widths and filters such as bollards should allow sufficient space for adapted cycles (used by people with disabilities) or cargo bikes.

More specifically we want the Grid to include:

- Filtered permeability (see below). Most links/routes on the Grid need modal filtering, allowing motor vehicle access to every address while removing through motor traffic.
- Safe crossings on main roads; minor and major crossroads need to be considered differently. Crossings must be both safe and convenient.
- Priority and Protection; crossings must not disadvantage cycle users. Grid routes must instead give both time advantage and priority to cycle users. Intersections between green, off-road, routes and on-road filtered cycle routes can include removal of signals (where this does not delay implementation).

## **1.6 Restrictions on Through Motor Traffic (Filtered Permeability)**

We welcome the statement in the consultation document that “we are suggesting that some of the busier secondary roads, where there is heavy cycle demand, are closed or restricted to through traffic to make them more cycle friendly” (p 14). Such measures are exactly what the Grid should incorporate for the benefit of both cyclists and pedestrians.

So called ‘filtered permeability’ has been used successfully in many parts of London and been associated with significantly increased cycle flows. LCC’s proposals for the Grid prioritise filtering measures as a way of creating routes that are attractive and can serve high volumes of cycle users without expensive infrastructure measures. We note that contraflows, without associated modal filters or traffic management schemes, do not achieve the same benefits as full permeability measures. Filtered permeability schemes have limited, if any impact on residents parking – De Beauvoir Town in Hackney is an example where residents actively lobbied for a filtered permeability scheme.

The essence of the LCC Central London Grid vision is a coherent network of such filtered routes where cyclists are not competing with through motor traffic but where access is maintained for services, deliveries and parking.

## **1.7 Capacity**

The consultation does not refer to cycling volumes along the routes but we note the Mayor’s target of a 400% increase in cycle use from 2001 to 2026. The numbers released by TfL show that London is currently on target to meet that figure. It is important therefore that the proposed network can handle the growth in cycling numbers with appropriate design of both junctions and links.

As the Mayor will surely be aware, junctions on popular cycle routes, such as the back street route through Islington that crosses City Road, can reach volumes in excess of 1500 cyclists per hour – high even by Dutch standards. Failure to make routes scalable or ‘adaptable’, to use the TfL term, can lead to hazardous junctions and conflicts with cars, cyclists and pedestrians.

Adopting a network with extensive filtered permeability measures, as suggested by LCC, offers greater potential for scalability.

## **1.8 Signage**

We note the proposal to use bus route numbers or tube lines to define routes. While this may seem attractive in PR terms it may simply confuse. Bus numbers are not recognisable to people from other areas and the tube map is schematic rather than geographic. The proposed routes do not directly follow either bus routes or tube lines.

One of the functions of a Grid network is to facilitate trips not supported by the existing tube and bus network. In addition it could provide attractive routes linking to and from the main line stations. Integrated cycle-rail journeys are growing as fast if not faster than other cycle use. The network and signage should facilitate this trend.

A more traditional designation by number or letter would likely be easier to navigate possibly complemented by colour. We note that Dutch use a node system (knoop-punkten) for their out of town routes.

We welcome high quality signage and use of on- road markings but note that all signage must be vandal proof, as it is in the Netherlands, and regularly maintained. We note the unfortunate case of the Olympic Cycling and Walking Routes, where poorly designed, but costly, signs were vandalised within days despite ample advice from stakeholders suggesting cheaper but less vulnerable signage. We also note that road markings on many LCN+ cycle routes have been worn away and, in boroughs like Tower Hamlets, the green cycle lane surfacing has turned into a pot-holed hazard. Such developments must be avoided by long-term formal borough commitments to maintain routes and signage.

## **1.9 Integration and Delivery**

The Grid must integrate with other programmes, namely the Superhighways and Quietways, which extend far beyond the Grid, but it must be recognised as a separate programme designed to rapidly deliver better conditions for cycling and walking in the heart of our city.

We note that the FAQ's for the consultation state that half the Grid will be delivered by 2016. LCC's original proposal in 2009 was for a Grid that could realistically be delivered in 12 months if commensurate political will is present at both City Hall and in the local borough's elected leadership. Given the potential for cycling growth as well as the greater ambition in the Mayor's 2012 Vision, and increased funding, we want to see a functioning Grid in place by 2015 and phase two complete a year later.

We note, with concern, that both the London Cycle Network (LCN) and the LCN+ were abandoned well before the networks were complete. Amongst the obstacles to the completion of the LCN+ were 140 'high-risk infrastructure barriers' as identified by the LCN+ project managers. The majority of the barriers were junctions and, of those, the majority were on TfL controlled roads. A repetition of this scenario with any of the Mayoral Vision programmes would be very unwelcome. Other infrastructure projects, such as Crossrail, are not left incomplete because everyone recognises that an incomplete rail or tube route will not function properly – the same is true of cycle networks which need to be followed through to completion even if there are two, coherent, stages to the process

We note that, already, TfL has stated that the cycle superhighways cannot be completed to the required standard unless an additional £50m is invested. The necessary funds must be allocated to complete this network, which will complement the Grid, to meet international best practice.

### **1.10 Junctions**

We welcome the commitment to the provision of 'safe routes through junctions separated physically or by traffic light phases from most motor traffic.' This commitment must not be diluted.

As is well established, collisions occur most frequently at junctions. Even the finest segregated tracks or modally-filtered streets will let cyclists down if road danger is not reduced at junctions. LCC has already highlighted the road danger at junctions along Stratford High Street, on the recently opened CS2 Extension, which undermine the benefits of this newly created separate cycling facility.

Along Grid routes cyclists should be confident that they have priority and that this will include being given priority at junctions. At busy junctions cyclists must be separated in time or space from motor traffic and recently proposed measures to create separate left and straight on traffic movements need to be utilised to achieve this.

We welcome the commitment to provide protected facilities for cycle users on busy roads but, as noted above, we do not wish to see this accompanied by a lack of consideration for cyclists when crossing side streets or at junctions. Along designated Grid cycle routes priority must be given to cycle users.

### **1.11 Critique of TfL Proposals**

At a basic level the routes selected for investment must be underpinned by a clear vision of a coherent, direct, safe, comfortable and attractive network accessible to all cyclists (universality). We note that these principles (considered essential in Holland) together with 'adaptability' (ability to cater for growing demand) are included in the Mayor's new draft London Plan.

Regrettably, the routes currently proposed do not appear to adhere consistently to such principles but instead seem to be an assembly of choices that boroughs favour, each on their own roads, in some cases apparently with only 'timid' cyclists in mind. This undermines the Mayor's Vision of a true network of cycle friendly streets that is needed in the centre of the capital to cater for existing and future demand. Such a network would cater to greater number of cyclists and offer better value for money.

Examination of the map of proposed routes shows that some boroughs have chosen many routes, others have selected few. Some routes are major 'desire' lines others have more local functions. Some routes duplicate the role of others and may be intended as alternatives but this is not clarified in the document. Cross-borough border links are not always present and there are evident gaps in the routes selected. Even where dense route coverage is indicated, gaps have sometimes been retained. The above inconsistencies create a problem with delivering a coherent, complete, easily legible and convenient network that TfL intends to sign prominently and present as a preferred choice for cycle users.

It is self-evident that cyclists do not choose routes based on borough borders - thus all routes, and their links to routes outside zone one, must be continuous and direct. This principle must include integration with park routes.

We note that the proposed Grid fails to address notable gaps in the cycle routes through Royal Parks. To quote Boris Johnson from his 2008 document Way to Go "I cannot understand the ban on cycling virtually everywhere in the Royal Parks." The Royal Parks are a resource for all Londoners and improved cycle access helps us to share the enjoyment of our green spaces with more people – the contribution of the Royal Parks to the Grid can be significant.

The apparent exclusion of Tower Hamlets from the Grid is unexplained and leaves an obvious gap in the network. The cycle hire scheme was extended to Tower Hamlets and the poor state of cycle routes in that borough is a long standing problem that needs to be confronted particularly in view of the rapid growth of new developments in Shoreditch and Whitechapel.

Completeness was part of LCC's brief for the Grid designed in 2009 and we made every effort to make sure all parts of central London were served by our proposed network. This is not yet the case with the newly proposed selection of routes.

## **2. The Central London Grid: Network and Routes**

While the current consultation conflates all cycle provision in the Zone 1 area we believe it is imperative to understand the vision of the Grid as a network of coherent routes that do much more than provide sections of respite from the worst traffic.

We welcome the central London Superhighways as feeder routes bringing large volumes of commuter cyclists into the Central Area. Generally these are on large roads with significant volumes of motor traffic which require space for cyclists separated from the motor traffic and with high level junction design to maintain priority.

The rest of the routes, that TfL refer to as the Central London Quietways, must be selected and prioritised to deliver an effective network allowing safe and inviting ways to navigate across the central area. The London Cycling Campaign vision has focussed on routes that take cyclists across the inner ring road and across the river. The priority must be for a relatively coarse grid of such routes, initially 300-400 metres apart.

### **2.1 Quick Routes for Slow Cyclists**

Done properly the Grid will deliver quick routes for slow cyclists as well as for experienced commuters.

### **2.2 Criteria for Route Selection.**

Central London is a maze of narrow and medium width streets with a random pattern of connections. That adds to the difficulty of identifying suitable through routes. The important criteria for Grid Routes are:

- They must be on roads with very low levels of motor traffic, below 2000 PCU per day. Due to declining motor traffic in this area it is possible to achieve this by filtering out through motor traffic on a selection of routes allowing for two-way cycling on these streets.
- Routes must provide access across the borough boundary roads and the river. There must be cross borough routes delivered in partnership between the Boroughs, Royal Parks and TfL.
- There must be a common level of service in every borough.
- The routes must provide two way travel for cycling - thus avoiding a complex one-way network and reducing the number of junctions to be negotiated.
- There must be safe and efficient junctions throughout. Getting the junctions right must be the most important investment in the delivery programme. This is most important at crossings of the Ring Road, and other routes with high volumes of motor traffic, where there should be separate phasing for cycle traffic without undue delay.
- On many minor junctions it will be possible to remove automatic signalling, providing priority junctions. Cyclists should have priority where expected volumes of cyclists are higher than other modes.
- Filtering out through motor traffic is the most cost effective way of delivering high quality cycling routes on the type of streets in the central area. That creates minimum disruption to parking for deliveries, services, clinics and residents. On some streets removing through motor traffic could free up space for essential services while still providing high quality cycle routes.
- To minimise disruption and maximise attractiveness the Grid routes should run through parks and garden squares

### **2.3 Other Route Benefits**



- The quietening and calming will be transformative for businesses and residents allowing for significant environmental gains.
- The routes must be designed to encourage pedestrian trips throughout the area on liveable streets

## 2.4 High Intensity Links

In addition to the Cycling Superhighways there are a number of high intensity links essential for a functioning grid that require a higher level of intervention to provide safe cycling. Typically these are on strong desire lines where there are not convenient quieter links nearby. Often these are also on street with significant bus flows.

- All bridges across the Thames: there are no alternative routes to the Thames bridges and none of the minor crossings (Millennium and Hungerford Bridges, proposed Garden Bridge) are open for cycling. We note, and welcome, the introduction of 20mph limits on London Bridge and Blackfriars bridges. In addition to the Cycle Superhighway routes all the other bridges require separate space for cycling. More importantly the junctions at each end must facilitate easy, stress-free access on and off the bridges.
- Theobalds road, Clerkenwell road, Old street: this link is the busiest cycle route into Central London with 64% of the vehicle traffic being cycles in the morning peak. It runs through three boroughs and has high frequency bus routes. We welcome the commitment to examine this route and call for a major redesign, removing through motor traffic. This will provide benefits for cyclists and bus users as well as help revive the street front economy in this area.
- Shoreditch High Street to London Bridge. This route has similar problems and high levels of casualties. It should become the second candidate route for a major re-design prioritising pedestrian, cycle and bus traffic. The partial removal of the Shoreditch gyratory system has demonstrated the huge economic gains that arise from de-prioritising private motor traffic.

## 3. Central London Grid Consultation Areas

The London Cycling Campaign has identified a coarse grained network of routes which can be delivered providing cross borough and cross London access for cyclists. The Mayor's consultation has been prepared with London boroughs but it provides a very varied mix of route densities with significant gaps.

### 3.1 The Royal Parks

While there are some existing routes through sections of the Central London Royal Parks they are over capacity and need other links to share the load. It is essential that the Royal Parks provide safe alternative routes for cycling. Currently cycle restrictions force cyclists onto some of the most hazardous roads in London and deter many people from cycling.

All the Central London Royal Parks should be open for cycling throughout the night while there is still high speed motor traffic on the alternate routes.

Regents Park needs a strong north south route on the Broad Walk and exiting through Brunswick Place to link straight across the ring road into Harley Street. The canal bridge at Charlbert Street is essential to link cyclists from the north west into the West End and City.

As well as facilitating the Cycling Super Highway East West route, Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens must support several east west and north south routes, crucially providing access to Kensington High Street and Bayswater / Notting Hill.

The Superhighway route through Green Park/St.James's needs north south linkages through the Spur Road gyratory and along the Queens Walk linking cross routes in Mayfair.

### **3.2 Lambeth**

Lambeth have proposed every minor street in the sector as a Quietway. Without a clear plan to provide linked - up routes with Southwark , and crossing the river, the benefits from quickly achieving a functioning network will be lost.

The minor routes are still important but should be developed as Quietway links feeding to and from the Grid network and the Cycle Superhighways.

### **3.3 Southwark**

The routes proposed for Southwark are close to those in the LCC network. The missing link in Union Street is inexplicable; we assume this was a drafting error and not a plot to disable the network in the vicinity of Transport for London offices.

The arbitrary closure of cycle network routes for the re-building of London Bridge station has caused chaos and must be remedied with a quiet link to Tower Bridge

### **3.4 City of London**

The proposed network in the City of London provides many useful links on a tortuous network of lanes. It does not greatly contribute to the whole of the Grid where a set of effective through routes is needed to avoid forcing cyclists onto the busiest streets and hazardous junctions.

For example we propose a through route on Charterhouse Street on the north side of Smithfield Market with a link through Grand Avenue (outside night-time market hours). This would minimise the number of junctions that need to be crossed and reduce the conflict between cyclists and market traffic.

### **3.5 Tower Hamlets**

There is nothing shown for Tower Hamlets. That is unacceptable and safe links are desperately needed across the ring road and to provide access to the City and Tower Bridge. Several routes linking South West Hackney with the rest of the borough require links through Tower Hamlets at the very least.

### **3.6 Hackney**

The London Borough of Hackney is already developing networks of quiet routes in the city centre section of Hackney. The major problems are safe crossings of the ring road and Transport for London Road Network. Many junctions need improved priority for people on bikes. The lack of involvement of Tower Hamlets make this difficult in the Shoreditch High Street / Bishopsgate area. Hackney must work with Islington and Camden to develop a high quality solution for the Old Street, Clerkenwell Road route.

### **3.7 Islington**

Islington needs to build on their existing cycling network to remove through motor traffic and increase capacity and priority at the crossings of the ring road and other major roads, particularly on the borough boundaries. Islington, along with Camden must be developing a high quality solution for the Old Street, Clerkenwell road routes.

### **3.8 Camden**

Current proposals for removing through motor traffic on the Torrington Place route should be seen as the model for all the routes in the Central London Grid scheme. Camden needs to ensure that gaps are removed to deliver a fully functional network particularly on the north south alignment of Tottenham Court Road and Gower Street and also a two way continuous east west route through Covent Garden.

### **3.9 City of Westminster**

The Westminster section includes some very useful routes, but they are too complex and need to be worked out as simpler two-way cycle routes throughout. The alternate routes shown on the consultation map are closer to those proposed by London Cycling Campaign. Filtering out through motor traffic in Marylebone is far better than the complex contraflows proposed and has less impact on services and parking.

Priorities should be direct crossing of the ring road especially into Regent's and Hyde Park. There need to be continuous north south routes linking the Superhighways through Green Park and Mayfair as well as through Trafalgar Square, Soho to Camden.

### **3.10 Kensington and Chelsea**

There are few if any satisfactory east west routes through Kensington and Chelsea and very poor connectivity between the ones shown. There is a poor casualty record on the east west main roads in the borough. Quietway routes should maximise the opportunities to cooperate with the Royal Parks and provide a route through Holland Park. The majority of the borough is outside the Central Area which London Cycle Campaign is prioritising for the Central Grid. As with all the boroughs we expect a consistent standard of cross borough Quietways linked to and supporting the Central Grid.