

London Assembly Transport Committee

Individual submissions to Outer London Junctions
investigation

(December 2017)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 July 2017 19:15
To: Transport Committee <TransportCommittee@london.gov.uk>
Subject: Walking and cycling at outer London junctions
Importance: High

Dear Transport Committee

Some time ago I wrote to the Mayor about my concerns at the failure of the 20 mph speed limits set in Haringey. I had no response and had to chase up his office. I was then told this was not the responsibility of the Mayor but a TfL issue. I am now resubmitting this letter to you as you are asking for evidence. I live in outer London and have cycled for over 30 years. I can tell you it's a nightmare cycling in the outer boroughs and far safer in central London. Please find attached the letter I sent to the mayor. Please don't ignore it as the original one was. No wonder people get discouraged from cycling!

I would like an acknowledgement of this email please.

regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



Dear Sadiq Khan

20 mph speed limits

When it was suggested that these were to be introduced in Haringey I was an enthusiastic supporter. When I later learned that there would be no speed cameras, little or nil policing and that the cost paid for it by TfL was around the £900,000 mark I was very disappointed.

I am a cyclist and I know what 20 mph feels like. Most of the streets round where I live in Hornsey N8 are 20 mph. I cycle and walk every day. The number of drivers observing the 20 mph limit is very much in the minority. So in fact the £900,000 seems to be a complete waste of money. What a pity that could not have been used to install speed cameras – the only incentive that will cause drivers to slow down.

If you want to cut pollution and you want to encourage cycling you need to enforce the 20 mph speed limit. I'm happy to take you with me on a cycle ride and show you exactly what's happening in my area: I'm regularly overtaken on narrow roads by people driving at 40-50 mph and some times faster than that especially at night. I've also noticed that some of the worst offenders are solo riders especially those delivering food such as the Deliveroo company whose main aim seems to be to get food to customers as fast as possible. These motorbikes are often travelling at 30-40 mph in 20 mph areas.

I help with a community road watch scheme where we operate speed guns in 20 mph areas. The number of people caught speeding is alarming. What's even more alarming is that drivers might get at least 3 warning letters before any real deterrent action is taken against them. As you know, the police are not involved in these roadwatches only Police Community Support Officers. The schemes are intermittent and don't take place at night when some of the worst offending occurs. Volunteers and PSSOs wear hi-vis jackets so that speeding cars often see us and have time to slow down before the speed gun can pick them up. Yet I hear that police in plain clothes are now picking up drivers using mobile phones whilst driving. Why can't the same kind of 'undercover' tactics apply to catching dangerous speeding drivers?

I'm writing to ask you to think of other solutions to preventing speeding before introducing any more of these zones. It's completely pointless and a waste of money unless areas are properly policed and offenders prosecuted.

Attached are the statistics for our north London Roadwatch indicating the number of drivers driving over 25 mph; we give them quite a bit of leeway. '0' does **not** indicate no speeding occurred; only that no-one was able to attend that event. The figures speak for themselves and are disturbing. Most of these events were held over only a period of an hour so the amount of speeding occurring is considerable.

Date	Time	Location	Results
7th Nov 2016	1200	Cranley Gardens j/w Linden Road N10	2
10th Nov 2016	1200	Outside 66 Shepherds Hill N6	76
15th Nov 2016	1200	White Hart Lane j/w Rivulet Road N17	0
17th Nov 2016	1200	Muswell Hill Road j/w Woodland Gardens N10	56
21st Nov 2016	1100	Outside 40 Wood Vale N10	60
22nd Nov 2016	1200	Crouch Hall Road j/w Bedford Road	11
23rd Nov 2016	1200	Bounds Green Road j/w Passmore Gardens	8
28th Nov 2016	1200	Ferme Park Road j/w Osian Road N4	27
1st Dec 2016	1200	Alexandra Park Road j/w Rosebery Road N10	0
2nd Dec 2016	1200	Wood Lane corner Parkwood Mews N6	0
7th Dec 2016	1200	Durnsford Road j/w Albert Road N22	105
9th Dec 2016	1200	Crouch End Hill j/w Waverley Road N8	
14th Dec 2016	1200	North Hill j/w View Road N6	

Durnsford Road and Wood Vale are some of the most dangerous roads I cycle along and the figures bear this out.

On a separate though related issue I applaud your decision to impose a £10 charge on older polluting cars entering central London. However, when the congestion charge was first introduced I noticed the drop in cars entering central London. Months later, it seemed we had returned to normal levels of congestion as drivers bit the bullet and paid up. This will happen also with a £10 surcharge. Much stronger measures are required such as total bans on diesel or even all cars entering central London at weekends. Outer London also needs protection from diesel toxins. We need to stop fearing backlashes from the motoring public and protect our children and ourselves.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted Signature]

[Redacted Address]



NEGATIVES:

- Segregation creates single file use pathway.
- Anti social as restricts users to walk or cycle in single file.
- Encourages less consideration and faster cycling.

POSITIVES:

- Clearly marked pathways.
- Rails add to safety.

RECOMMEND:

- Shared use pathway preferably on all pathways within 100m of the roundabout. Consistency matters.



NEGATIVES:

- Single file use pathway.
- Not much room to pass oncoming users.
- Anti social as too tight to comfortably walk or cycle 2 by 2.
- Not clear if cycling is permissible.

POSITIVES:

- Pleasant smell of the greenery for a pollution hot spot.
- Rails add to safety.

RECOMMEND:

- Slight trimming of greenery to widen pathway.
- Shared use pathway preferably on all pathways within 100m of the roundabout. Consistency matters.



NEGATIVES:

- Most of the crossings are not easy for drivers or pedestrians to see.
- Most crossings don't have a safe mode of crossing on multiple lanes.
- At commuter times there will be less breaks in the traffic to cross safely.
- Crossings are not clearly marked across the roads.
- Priority is for traffic.
- Not safe for youngsters or older people.

POSITIVES:

- I found the placement of the crossings convenient enough.
- For the most able and those with good road sense running across the lanes between traffic is time efficient.
- Some time may be saved by traffic, but hard braking could occur.

RECOMMEND:

- Marked coloured crossings preferably.
- Crossings need to be very well lit.
- Short wait pedestrian crossing lights at all crossings.
- I agree with the proposal to change the angle of the junction entering the business park to slow traffic and also the idea of changing the road surface to prioritise pedestrians.



From: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] October 2017 16:52
To: Transport Committee
Subject: How can we enable more people to walk and cycle?

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I have been thinking about this problem for a while.

The elephant in the room is letting cars dominate all Rds.

They don't have to.

If we had a network of car free routes many more people would cycle and walk than presently do.

Below are some notes expanding on the idea.

Yours

[REDACTED]

Car free walking and cycling argument.

Integrated transport.

Green veins running through London.

Now, with 23000 Londoners a year dying from illegal levels of pollution, Greenhouse gasses changing our climate and 170,000 extra cars in London last year it's clear that the Government and local councils have no clear idea what to do, it's time for new idea.

The idea is simple. A network of car free roads for walkers and cyclists.

- The basic argument
- Cars, Congestion and Pollution
- vs
- Cycle Quiet Ways and Green Streets
- Facts –
 - ? How many of us own cars?
 - ? The Tax angle
 - ? Costs
 - ? Harm from cars
 - ? Pollution
 - ? Noise
 - ? Stress
 - ? Solving the problems
 - ? Needs
 - ? The idea – What are Green or Healthy Streets?
 - ? The Basic Argument
 - ? Solutions - Quiet-ways
 - ? Advantages
 - ? Practicality
 - ? Walking and Cycling
 - ? Summary

Walking Is the humans most perfect form of exercise and movement, 20 mins three times a week will keep you alive and 20 minutes every day will keep you fit.

People in large don't walk much and a main reason for that is, well it's not nice out there, it's not countryside and it's not calm or clean and crossing any road is taking a life and death risk, It can be a positive elixir.

Cycling has many benefits. a simple solution to so many problems.

Most journeys that could be made on a bicycle aren't and won't be done because it is dangerous.

Imagine, if you will, you want to travel to your mum's house 5 miles away: Your group includes your 85 year old grandparents and 5 year old child. Normally you all go in cars, because gramps doesn't like the bus, walking is too far and cycling on those busy roads is simply madness. However, in this story, you all get on bicycles and cycle the whole way along quiet, car free, leafy avenues, only stopping at junctions, to let the cross traffic pass. You arrive calm, relaxed, healthy, happier, fitter and unharmed; sounds idyllic, doesn't it?

"Ok, nice story, but that won't happen", I hear you say. Well, let's not write it off quite so quickly.

The Healthy Streets initiative from Sadiq Khan's office is basically this, but without stopping cars.

There are many advantages to car free roads and many are very seductive.

There are a lot of road users who presently can't use the roads safely; they include cyclists, equestrians, gardeners, walkers, dog walkers, cats, stall holders, street food sellers, squirrels, birds and kids playing.

It must be remembered just how roads that for centuries have been public space are now exclusively for cars.

We can combine all the various Quiet-Ways, Healthy Streets, Open Streets, cycle routes, unused back streets, parks and abandoned railways and stitch them into a network of calm, green corridors, for non- drivers.

Guardian:

About 1-2% of trips in the UK are made by bike, considerably fewer than in many other European countries.

A [x-gu://item/mobile.guardianapis.com/uk/items/environment/bike-blog/2013/apr/24/all-party-cycling-inquiry-report](http://mobile.guardianapis.com/uk/items/environment/bike-blog/2013/apr/24/all-party-cycling-inquiry-report) report by MPs in 2013 called for a share of 10% by 2025, to be achieved by spending £20 per person annually on cycling provision, notably safe bike lanes.

I point out that there are no safe bike lanes because every vehicle is a danger to a cyclist.

TfL <<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/department-for-transport-settlement-at-the-spending-review-2015>>
<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/department-for-transport-settlement-at-the-spending-review-2015>

The government has committed to fully funding the <<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/road-investment-strategy>> Road investment strategy. Highways England will deliver 112 major roads schemes worth over £15 billion to 2020-21, with an average benefit of £4 for every £1 invested.

That's for cars, so what have they put into CO2 free walking and cycling, their 1st & 2nd priorities??

TfL to spend £770m on cycling over the next five years.

<<http://www.roadsafetygb.org.uk/starsol.php?t=news-view&uin=5463&oo=latestFirst>>
<http://www.roadsafetygb.org.uk/starsol.php?t=news-view&uin=5463&oo=latestFirst>

So it's £15,000,000,000 for their forth priority and £770,000 for their first and second priorities combined, convinced?

In the UK 57 per cent of people commute by car, 5 per cent are a passenger in a car or van and 16 per cent use public transport. Seven per cent take the bus, 10.7 per cent walk and just 2.9 per cent - 800,000 people - cycle to the office. Just under a third of everyone who works in London gets there by public transport.

<<http://www.express.co.uk/life-style/life/493116/Commuting-facts-from-around-the-world>>
<http://www.express.co.uk/life-style/life/493116/Commuting-facts-from-around-the-world>

Facts - Cars, Pollution & Problems.

Crudely CO2 emission break down to

50% agriculture, 25 % transport, 25% domestic heating.

93% of total domestic transport greenhouse gas emissions were from road transport.

Pollution is killing 9M a year 23,000 in London.

CO2 causes climate change, climate change is dangerous.

Most journeys in London are 5 to 15 minute drives.

Cycling and walking are the only viable non-CO2 modes of transport.

People won't cycle because cars make it dangerous.

People will cycle when its safe.

So If we want people to cycle, we need to invest in car free networks.

Of all trips made in 2013, 18% were less than one mile in length, 67% less than 5 miles and 95% were less than 25 miles.

Fossil fuel & CO2 emissions threaten our health and safety. More people are being diagnosed and dying each year from asthma brought on from air pollution. We need a carbon neutral alternative and we need it as soon as possible. That's why TFL have made walking and cycling 1st and 2nd priority.

Thanks to Dr Beeching we embraced the private car without thinking about the impact if we all drove. So we closed public rail and invested in roads , it turns out he had shares in Marples Ridgway who got Gov road building contracts.,,,

The car has now squeezed itself into every nook and cranny of our lives and having insinuated itself onto every road in existence, it continues to squeeze out other road users, making it less and less possible for anyone outside of a car to use the roads in safety.

Cars are fires, millions of fires, in every country, every day.

Cars are dangerous

Most cyclist are aware that they are whizzing about balanced on two wheels surrounded by steel boxes weighing a ton and that a collision will hospitalise the cyclist and the driver might get not even get a scratch on the car; drivers really don't understand.

Cars are pumping out poisons, screaming by at lethal speeds and cluttering every road, pavement and many cycle lanes.

Even the manufacturing of them is an ecological disaster. They are alternately dangerous, poisonous or in the way. All of this puts off potential cyclists.

HYPERLINK " <http://www.landscapearchitecture.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/cycling_joy_in_chicago.jpg>
http://www.landscapearchitecture.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/cycling_joy_in_chicago.jpg" Urban cycling can be a joy - as in Chicago[/caption]

How many of us own cars?

There are 35.6 million cars in the UK

In 2016, London's car population rose by 170,000.

Official guesstimates suggest there are about 27 million households in the UK and about 31 million cars.

In broad terms, a quarter of households don't have a car, 45 per cent have one car, a quarter have two cars, and the remaining five percent have three or more cars. Do the maths.

So about 61 per cent – or 19 million of the cars on UK roads – are the family's 2nd 3rd or 4th car.

20 Million people own cars, and 45 Million people do not own cars.

This means more than two thirds do not own cars. So, car owners may be majority of households, but they are a minority of the people.

The Tax angle

Drivers do not pay for the roads, though having paid a lot of money for their cars, seek to be treated with special privilege when it comes to road use.

Road tax doesn't exist. It's car tax, a tax on cars and other vehicles, not a tax on roads or a fee to use them. Motorists do not pay directly for the roads.

In 1926, Winston Churchill started the process to abolish road tax. It was finally culled in 1937.

So, who does pay for the roads? We all do.

Roads are paid for out of general taxation; thus a child buying a sweet somewhere along the line, is paying for the roads. And yet, it is car drivers that make roads dangerous and unpleasant for everyone else.

Road Space Efficiency

Cars take up so much space than bicycles and bicycles in comparison are highly efficient users of the road, watch cyclists weave their way through traffic jams. Also bicycles don't burn fossil fuel.

Costs

Roads without cars don't get damaged.

Bicycle only roads, needing less upkeep, cost less and last longer, with the added bonus of healthy people costing the NHS less.

Harm from cars

We have an understandable love affair with cars, but the harm that cars do is massive and accepted as inevitable. The use and manufacture, the sheer clutter on every road, the uglification of our surroundings, an unbroken stream of vehicles running through every scene, bringing noise and danger at every turn, raising chronic asthma and occasional sudden death (about 3000 times a year), not to mention all the greenhouse gases, CO1, CO2, NO2, habitat destruction & climate change! For all the convenience they bring, the negatives are long term and overwhelming.

Air Pollution

Pollution is appalling and most cycle lanes are right next to busy traffic which is constantly pumping out poisonous fumes and particulates. The media just published figures that are breath-taking: 29,000 deaths a year in London are attributable to traffic pollution. This is equivocal to a humanitarian disaster.

Cars create toxic fumes and cyclists and pedestrians are forced to breathe in this polluted air. It is actually illegal to ask anyone to breath that air!

Noise

Planes, helicopters, lorries, cars, boom boxes, bass heads, building construction work, police sirens & TV; it's all loud. We live in an increasingly noisy world, a non-stop cacophony accompanies every moment of our lives. I measured Streatham High Street and the noise on average was above 70 DB and up over 100 with big or noises vehicles.

If you need to raise your voice to be heard 3 feet away, the noise level is damaging your hearing; in a factory you would, by law, have to wear noise suppressing ear protectors. Yet every road is louder than that. It has been shown to be stressful to the point where it produces ca <https://articles.mercola.com/sites/articles/archive/2016/03/24/chronic-stress-cancer.aspx?utm_source=twitter.com&utm_medium=referral&utm_content=twittermercola_ranart&utm_campaign=20171020_chronic-stress-cancer>ncers, poor memory and dementia. Cars are a major part of that noise. Greenery soaks up noise, the more greenery, the less noise, the less noise the less cancers etc. Also people don't walk, because there are few places to go that are nice and quiet. So faced with horroble exteriorous we stay inside.

Stress

Noise causes stress, stress causes cancer.

https://articles.mercola.com/sites/articles/archive/2016/03/24/chronic-stress-cancer.aspx?utm_source=twitter.com
<[https://articles.mercola.com/sites/articles/archive/2016/03/24/chronic-stress-cancer.aspx?](https://articles.mercola.com/sites/articles/archive/2016/03/24/chronic-stress-cancer.aspx?utm_source=twitter.com&utm_medium=referral&utm_content=twittermercola_ranart&utm_campaign=20171020_chronic-stress-cancer)
[utm_source=twitter.com&utm_medium=referral&utm_content=twittermercola_ranart&utm_campaign=20171020_chronic-stress-cancer](https://articles.mercola.com/sites/articles/archive/2016/03/24/chronic-stress-cancer.aspx?utm_source=twitter.com&utm_medium=referral&utm_content=twittermercola_ranart&utm_campaign=20171020_chronic-stress-cancer)> &utm_medium=referral&utm_content=twittermercola_ranart&utm_campaign=20171020_chronic-stress-cancer

Health:

Perhaps the most serious problem created by sound pollution is the impact it has on our health. Because sound pollution can trigger the body's stress response, one of its major health effects is chronic stress and the high levels of stress hormones that go with it. As a result, noise pollution has also been linked with health problems such as heart disease, high blood pressure, and stroke. It's also been linked with musculoskeletal problems, as a Cornell University study on office noise found that those working in noisy office environments can also be less likely to ergonomically adjust their workstations for comfort, which can contribute to physical problems. Noise pollution can also impact sleep quality by preventing sleep and disrupting sleep cycles also produce dementure. And, perhaps most significantly, because chronic stress can lower your immunity to all disease, noise pollution is a general threat to health and wellness.

Needs

To help cycling become a viable alternative to the car and become the main preferred method of getting from A to B, it needs to be an absolutely and demonstrably safe alternative to driving for all.

Be it men, women, children, the old, the frail, the timid, the bold and the young fit cycle warrior.

Safety is paramount and to achieve this, investments would need to be made.

There have been many suggestions about what needs to be done however most are just tweaking the problem when what we really need is a complete re-evaluation of who gets to use the roads.

Is the car still the ruler of the road? Is it time for a change? I think so.

SOLVING THOSE PROBLEMS:

Cycling & CO2

We have the tools, its just a matter of using them.

Transport accounts for about 50% of the CO2 we can get control of in our cities.

If we want to be safe in the future, we can't use the oils we have now, let alone that which fracking etc can provide. Oil fuelled vehicles must be used less.

We need now, and have for a very long time needed, a carbon negative economy. Car free routes would provide a truly viable alternative.

If the Government were really serious about reducing CO2 emissions, it would make it enjoyable to walk and safe for all cyclists to use the roads.

Therefore, the Government must make it safe for my 80 years old mother and my 5 year old daughter to cycle. Otherwise, my mum will continue to drive and I will be forced to drive my children, because I don't want them killed on the roads.

Achieving this is actually quite easy, but it's scary for government and councils, because it's a big change in the accepted way of doing things and the car lobby is strong and organised. Politicians fear voters will not vote for those who threaten car use.

The idea - What are Green or Healthy Streets?

To create a network of car free roads right around London - and the whole country.

Imagine roads as parks. Imagine these roads with no cars and children playing in safety. People extending their gardens into the roads, growing vegetables and fruits. Imagine the buried rivers brought back to the surface.

Imagine benches under trees where people can sit out and enjoy the peace and calm. All around is green and verdant and rich with life. The air will become cleaner as plants grow. People will become healthier physically and mentally.

The streets become, not a conduit for cars, but a space for people to live and thrive in.

This plays into the Healthy Streets, Linear Park and London as National Park ideas.

Picture is from <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/healthy-streets-for-london.pdf>

Roads into parks.

I do recognise that this will take time to achieve, but it is the ultimate goal.

Solutions - Quiet-ways

TfL wants walkers and cyclists to use what they refer to as "quiet streets with little traffic", not car free. So they are still dangerous and scary, and that's not going to encourage your average person to take up cycling.

Things work best when they are community led and not imposed. I suggest we could start by finding roads with the fewest car owners, proposing the idea and letting communities volunteer their roads, then see how they could be connected. Ask, advertise and explain the advantages with gentle persuasion.

Even though we do have a pre [existing](http://wp.hackneyplay.org) ecological imperative, we may need to offer incentives and encouragement. Although, as these pilots begin, people will become more aware, even envious and want their streets to be as [as nice](http://wp.hackneyplay.org) as those Healthy Streets (similar to the Play Street Orders where local roads in Hackney had regular closures for children to be able to play out after school wp.hackneyplay.org).

'Quiet-way' is a [Transport for London \(TfL\)](http://www.landscapearchitecture.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/garden_street_vauxhall.jpg) idea. Most of them are old London Cycle Network routes with new signs and a few minor improvements, slightly less cars use them. The name alone is lovely.

[caption id="attachment_3418" align="alignnone" width="1000"] [HYPERLINK "http://www.landscapearchitecture.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/garden_street_vauxhall.jpg"](http://www.landscapearchitecture.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/garden_street_vauxhall.jpg) INCLUDEPICTURE "http://www.landscapearchitecture.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/garden_street_vauxhall.jpg" \d Green streets are great for cycling - and for living. They can also have space for car parking (Vauxhall, London)[/caption]

ADVANTAGES

It's safe for our children.

It's cheap.

It's easily achievable.

It cuts NHS costs

Achieves CO2 targets

Reduces pollution

Increases biomass

Produces calm

Quality of life

This scheme would bring calm, joy, safety and health to so many people, that, that alone should be enough although the real pay back will be in many years' time when healthy people reduce NHS costs and transport is easy along the linea parks of London (& anywhere else). This scheme will be cheaper and far more effective than the Garden Bridge ever could have been.

Health

It is obvious that we all value our health and that the NHS has to fork out billions to help us when we are sick, but if we did have a greener, car free, cycle network we would walk and cycle more.

How many times have we wanted to go out but don't because, well where would we go? It's all a built environment, its brash & dull and isn't a nice place to walk.

Walking and cycling more will keep us fitter and that means we won't have to visit our GP's quite so much. So, there would be a clear cost reduction in healthcare for <<https://cleantechnica.com/2012/07/25/plants-can-reduce-air-pollution-in-cities-60-according-to-study/>> the State and financial benefit to households.

Planting

Plants Can Reduce Air Pollution in Cities by 60%,

The study reports that levels of nitro <<https://cleantechnica.com/2012/07/25/plants-can-reduce-air-pollution-in-cities-60-according-to-study/>> gen dioxide and particulate matter, both hazardous to humans, were lowered by 40 and 60 percent, respectively.

<https://cleantechnica.com/2012/07/25/plants-can-reduce-air-pollution-in-cities-60-according-to-study/>

Wellbeing

Wellbeing studies carried out by the NHS have shown that living near green spaces has a definite, positive and measurable impact on our health. Green walking & cycle networks would bring green space closer to all of us and we would all benefit from this.

This also will reduce NHS costs significantly.

Desirable living spaces

People would like to live on these new cycle routes. Indeed, it could actually make the houses on those roads worth a lot more than those on the internal combustion routes.

The quieter, greener roads would be lovely places to live and work as well as places for walkers and cyclists to travel through.

House prices

Most of us would opt for those homes in quieter streets, instead of those on busy routes, it would certainly increase the value of those homes.

Crime Drops.

Several studies nationwide suggest that gardens and green space might help to lower crime rates. In San Francisco's Mission District, crimes dropped 28 percent after a community garden led to the formation of a neighbourhood watch group. In Chicago, professors Frances Kuo and William Sullivan compared crime rates among 98 apartment buildings in a public housing project. They found buildings with high levels of vegetation had 52 percent fewer crimes than buildings with low levels.

There are 10 Healthy Streets Indicators:

- Pedestrians from all walks of life -

London's streets should be welcoming places for everyone to walk, spend time in and engage in community life.

- People choose to walk, cycle and use public transport. A successful transport system enables more people to walk and cycle more often.
- Clean air

Improving air quality delivers benefits for everyone and reduces unfair health inequalities.

- People feel safe

The whole community should feel comfortable and safe on our streets at all times. People should not feel worried about road danger.

- Not too noisy

Reducing the noise impacts of traffic will directly benefit health and improve the ambience of our streets.

- Easy to cross

Making streets easier to cross is important to encourage more walking and to connect communities.

- Places to stop and rest

A lack of resting places can limit mobility for certain groups of people.

- Shade and shelter

Providing shade and shelter enables everybody to use our streets, whatever the weather.

- People feel relaxed. More people will walk or cycle, if our streets are not dominated by motor traffic, and if pavements and cycle paths are not overcrowded, dirty or in disrepair.
- Things to see and do

People are more likely to use our streets when their journey is interesting and stimulating, with attractive views, buildings, planting and street art.

Practical Solutions:

Filtering

There are many types of filtering, a simple one is bollards across the road; wheel chairs, walkers and cyclists can pass, but not cars.

This allows for green streets.

Access for cars

Cul-de-sac's, no through roads.

No one should be stopped from getting to their homes or stopped from parking close to their homes.

The main thing that would change is that vehicles could only enter and leave from one end of a green street.

This would give us all access.

Where we cannot prevent through traffic, chicanes can be used as in this image.

Parking

Green Cycling Routes would not all be totally car free. Although 'no cars' is the goal, presently we still need parking space. GCNs could accommodate substantial and convenient car parking. Providing more car clubs and secure cycle pods would reduce the need to own a car.

Councils and Governments can offer inducements.

Emergency access

What if we need to get an ambulance to your home?

On many roads, this won't be a problem. For places where there is a risk all accident & emergency services vehicles

already have the standard key.

Walking and Cycling

Of all trips made in 2013, 18% were less than one mile in length, 67% less than 5 miles and 95% were less than 25 miles.

People don't walk much in London because it's not very nice. It's loud, dirty and lacks anything that approaches a relaxing walk in the country, so we don't walk. But we could make it delightful.

42% of people in England aged 5 and over owned a bicycle over the years 2012-2014.

Encouraging cycling is as much psychological as anything else.

Cycling is dangerous; If we think we're not safe, that's it, we won't cycle.

Quietways are a step in the right direction true, but any moving vehicle represents a threat, if it touches you or your child's bike, it will send a body flying.

Close scrapes terrify and injure and dissuade people from cycling.

Are Quiet-Ways safe?

Is your child safe on a Quiet-Way? No.

The danger that a car or lorry presents to a human on a bicycle is obvious. The painted lines used to make most UK cycle lanes will not stop drivers whose attention wanders from ploughing through cyclists. The same applies to raised kerbs. Would you let your 5-year-old use a typical UK cycle lane? Would you even think them safe on Cycle Superhighway or Quietway? No? Me neither.

Pootling vs Warrior Mode Cycling

The joys of cycling include pootling, meandering and taking it easy. This is not something you can do on dangerous cycle routes where you need to be in 'warrior mode' all the time. Powered vehicles are a threat to walkers and cyclists. How can one relax and enjoy the scenery when you are constantly at risk of being knocked down? Fear discourages cycling.

Would anyone be forced to cycle?

Certainly not. You can still drive your car, hopefully an electric Zip car, from your house and park it by your friend's house just as before, it's just that some roads would be for cyclists and walkers alone to travel through.

Summary

Something has to change.

London pollution levels are going through the roof (latest London news report 18th Oct 2017).

Planetary ecology looks as if it could go tits up really easily even the manufacture of cars is causing problems even before they are driven 1 inch.

Alternatives are needed now.

We need to make walking and cycling car free and safe.

London needs a network of streets to become ecologically sound, healthy living spaces, not car conduits.

Quality of life would rise and CO2 emissions would drop.

Road repair would fall, as would the costs to the NHS.

Green, Car Free Routes, as suggested above and supported by Sadiq Khan are visions of Healthy Streets.

London ought to be setting an example to the rest of the world.

All of this is not only necessary but entirely possible.

All of this is not only necessary but entirely possible.

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click here

<<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/AbvDcDHmxoDGX2PQPOMvUtA0IxE6yMtz5odHrnXQ3sXSTaCs8AzCo8hkldNP9>

4+HWv+wXbOo7NSZtQUzGWYsdQ==> to report this email as spam.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 August 2017 16:39
To: Transport Committee
Subject: Walking & Cycling at Outer London Junctions

One outer London borough that I regularly cycle in, Hillingdon, does very little to encourage its residents to cycle. Despite opportunities to create a coherent network little has been done to provide facilities that would enable modal shift. One example of a key junction that needs addressing is Hillingdon Circus; this has changed little since the A40 was diverted under the underground line and is particularly nasty for both pedestrians and cyclists. Long Lane and Swakelys Road could accommodate protected cycle lanes (the roads are particularly wide) with little affect on motorised traffic. This leads to the Uxbridge Road which is a urban duel carrigeway with large junctions seemingly designed just for motor traffic and little to no consideration given to active transport modes. Uxbridge Town centre has a fast, 3 lane + wide racetrack which does little to encourage people to walk or cycle in the area. Some consideration has been given to cyclists by making the pavements shared use but seems to be taking years for the correct signage to be erected. Unfortunately the local MP for Uxbridge and South Ruislip seems to have made little difference, which is a shame given his previous experience at encouraging walking and cycling.

I am sure that many outer London boroughs have the same issues and despite the funding offered by previous Mayors of London to increase walking and cycling this hasn't resulted in much change in the modal share. Perhaps the success of the Waltham Forest, Mini Holland, project will show more reticent authorities that roads don't grind to a halt when filtered permeability schemes are implemented.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click
<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/JFNPwcoQpY7GX2PQPOMvUhStAXIT3N1z3Euq4L1kzhK37tlflfNKNumDjj0du215G4i22P8zz+KGoJj9+I0bOg==> to report this email as spam.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 August 2017 16:29
To: Transport Committee
Subject: Walking and Cycling in Outer London- response to call for evidence

Dear Caroline Russell,

Many thanks for calling for evidence in regard to Walking and Cycling in Outer London.

Firstly, a little background about myself. I work full time as a fashion designer and have two children aged 13 and 10. I have lived in Walthamstow since 1998 and I am 49 years old. In other words, I am very unlikely to be a cyclist in London, and like many other Londoners I rely on public transport.

In 2005 I was struggling to get my 5 year old to his reception class and my 2 year old to his childminder a few streets away from the primary school, and get back to my desk in time to start work on time. I suggested to my husband we buy a bike with a baby seat to cross the borough and speed up my journey. Sadly, even though I planned to cycle the majority of the journey on the pavement, both of us decided cycling with small children was too dangerous. We bought our first car instead.

It wasn't until my younger son also started school two years later that I began to walk the children to school again, and I remembered all the positive things I had missed out on while driving. I had relaxed conversations with my children, engaged with other walking parents and residents on the way, and felt more embedded with the local and school community. Of course there were many mornings when I had to use the school breakfast club, and I felt and still do feel empathy for the time-pressured parents who feel the need to drop their children off by car before travelling onto work.

I learned that walking my children to school was the most positive way to get my children to school despite the hostile walking conditions in our borough that were present at that time.

In 2014 the Mini Holland programme began to be rolled out across the borough and the difference for anyone who walks as a mode of transport has been like night and day. No-one will really understand how hostile their walking environment is until it is changed for them, and I cannot express how radical the change is here. It is on the basis of this experience of the past two years that I make the following observations and recommendations -

1. The only way to make roads feel safer to walk on is to reduce the amount of traffic that travels on them. I live on a street that has not been filtered and it still used as a rat-run for local traffic. There are often stand-offs and heated arguments about who should pass, sometimes resulting in people ramming cars and driving on the pavement. The people engaging in this behaviour are not our neighbours, they are stressed drivers using our residential street as a service. And while they are fighting and driving aggressively against each other, they are not concerned about who lives on the road or who is trying to cross it.

Dr Rached Aldred has observed that pedestrians are 50% more likely to be run over on a residential street than a major road. It is poor driver behaviour and a lack of safe crossing places that makes our residential streets a hazard.

My journey with my children to school was transformed when Brook Road E17 was filtered. Fewer cars meant the road was safe to cross, the stand-offs finished, the backlog of cars finished. It felt safe to walk.

2. The only way to get more parents and children cycling is by rolling out segregated cycling lanes. Many parents take their children to school and run errands with their children. Children under the age of 11 have no concept the white stripe painted on the road is for them to follow. I often cycle behind my son calling out instructions, he has no concept of road position, danger, speed or road priority. If I tell him to cycle in the cycle lane, he cannot tell the difference between that white line and all the other white lines - especially when cars are parked in the cycle lanes. Segregated cycle lanes immediately remove all of these issues and mean we can just focus on what direction we are travelling in. It feels safer.

I would never cycle with children without segregated lanes or filtered roads.

If you want nervous cyclists to cycle, then you need to make them feel safe, and my experience is segregated cycling is the only way.

3. Parents that walk their children to school will be amongst the biggest champions of traffic filtering and no-drive

zones.

The Mini Holland scheme in Walthamstow was initially aimed at encouraging cycling - with mixed response. Because there were not many visible cyclists in the borough, many people could not see why cycling should be made safer. If you place more emphasis on safer journeys to school, then you will get widespread support. Making streets access only around schools is an excellent initiative - especially if policed!

It seems to be a theme everyone can agree on - that children should a) be able to travel to school safely and b) should walk to school, regardless of their attitude to filtering or car access.

4. Ensure pavements feel safe to walk on

Allowing dropped kerbs for off-street parking has resulted in hostile pedestrian environments in areas such as Loughton and Manor Park. If the whole street becomes a driveway, then it makes the pavement less attractive to walk on. If one resident is allowed a drop kerb, many other neighbours follow, making the street a stretch of junctions to be crossed.

Wider pavements without interruptions, preferably with a cycle lane to separate pedestrians from traffic further still, will encourage pedestrians. Good lighting, with planting and trees, will ensure the area has the feeling of safety, as well as being more attractive.

5. Fill public transport 'holes' in outer boroughs

London has a world class public transport in the centre of the city, but this service becomes less reliable and less frequent in the outer boroughs. Many areas in the outer boroughs have public transport 'holes' that encourage car use. Where those gaps are identified, there should be investment to address this issue, investing in tram services on major roads and re-opening existing train routes.

6. Get the NHS behind walking and cycling

Trusted bodies such as the NHS should work with the GLA and explain the benefits of using public transport and how walking and cycling can reduce the strain on public services and improve our air quality.

The NHS as a whole has been strangely silent in terms of encouraging the population to reduce their car use and sing other modes of transport - given the current evidence, it would make sense that the NHS become walking and cycling champions.

I trust the above insight from a non-expert is helpful, and I am happy to respond to further queries should you require more information.

Yours

[Redacted Signature]

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click here

<<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/ZLHMLja6ITjGX2PQPOMvUmaGI8Tu3yGruefkgxCXNnbFRsr9ZkGzjoNEY+hoyYz5G4i22P8zz+KGoJj9+I0bOg==>> to report this email as spam.

From:

[Redacted Email Address]

Sent: 11 August 2017 14:22

To: Transport Committee

Cc: Bambos Charalambous

Subject: Walking & Cycling at Outer London Junctions

I find it laughable that you are taking such a survey when the people of Warwick Road N11 have been asking you to make the junction of Warwick Road and the North Circular Road safer for residence, cyclists and school children for years to no avail.

The pollution on the road has increased (resulting in my and others asthma getting worse), children are in danger going to and from school (2 schools locally), many use the road as there is a shop half way along, and in the last month I have seen a car miss two children by less than a yard.

This problem was caused by TfL when it upgraded the NCR and made Warwick road a 'rat-run'. Since then both TfL and Enfield Council have blamed each other and neither has taken any positive steps to improve the matter.

This has resulted in;

- * poor health,
- * fume pollution,
- * noise pollution,
- * locals having to suffer aggression and abuse from drivers
- * unable to open windows in the house
- * children in danger of traffic
- * people wanting to move out of the road, but now unable as prices have fallen and people will not view properties on the road (source: local estate agents), thus you have blighted the properties
- * road accidents occur most days, from wing mirrors being broken to cars hitting and denting residents parked cars as the road is not designed and wide enough to take the traffic.
- * Also residences are suffering cracks in their walls due to the heavy traffic.

None of this happened before as it was a quiet road.

So I suggest that you clear up some of the mess you have caused before you look at improving other areas, PLEASE.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

<https://www.avast.com/sig-email?utm_medium=email&utm_source=link&utm_campaign=sig-email&utm_content=webmail> Virus-free. www.avast.com <https://www.avast.com/sig-email?utm_medium=email&utm_source=link&utm_campaign=sig-email&utm_content=webmail>

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click here

<<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/7OpPYJdqB4jGX2PQPomvUnWSlf6oUOY88qTqECg2mUoHM+I6DffXqUzuJnqwN157G4i22P8zz+Jue2rhFpgg0Q==>> to report this email as spam.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 11 August 2017 13:37

To: Transport Committee

Subject: Junctions in Outer London

To the Transport Committee:

I am writing in response to your call for feedback about outer London junctions. In particular, I would like to draw your attention to the very problematic and controversial junction of Warwick Road, N11, with the A406, altered by TfL in 2012 with the very dubious aim of shifting traffic from nearby A & B roads onto a narrow and predominantly residential street.

As any traffic analyst will tell you, the predictable result is known as 'induced traffic', whereby traffic is not reduced but multiplied when a new route - in this case a handy new right turn for rat-runners off the North Circular - is introduced. Needless to say, traffic in the area has increased drastically, the neighbourhood has been ruined, and incentive to walk or cycle has all but disappeared: certainly I have not dared get on a bicycle on our road since 2012, and crossing the road as a pedestrian, to face the ire of rat-runners, is an extremely risky operation.

As for the A406 where it meets Warwick Road, it must be one of the most dangerous junctions on the North Circular. Rat-runners trying to beat the light cross the junction at terrifying speeds, and motorists in both directions on the A406 perform U-turns on a daily basis - this where children are walking to the nearby Bowes Primary School during term-time. Where else is it legal for motorists to make a U-turn across 3 lanes of high-speed traffic, within metres of a primary school?

The fact that our current mayor is prioritising air pollution and more liveable neighbourhoods, and our local council (Enfield) is doing everything to promote its cycle scheme -- while yet both TfL and LBE have colluded to create a rat-run out of a residential street and a dangerous junction which positively discourages walking and cycling, is both baffling and infuriating for local people.

Are there lessons to be learned from previous junction 'improvements'?

Do not prioritise (mostly non-local) 'traffic flow' over the health and safety of local people.

How can we enable more people to walk and cycle?

Design junctions that are more sympathetic to the needs of people in the area. Look to successful schemes like the 'Mini-Holland' schemes in London for examples. Keep traffic on main roads: stop allowing residential streets in London to be thoughtlessly used - as Warwick Road has been - as funnels for congestion elsewhere. It doesn't work, and in this age of increased pollution awareness, is unacceptable.

How can we make our streets and junctions less hostile to people getting around by bike and on foot?

See above.

How do you get all road users on board?

Do we have to? Maybe motorists just have to adapt:

Make other options, such as public transport, more attractive. Look at real evidence of 'traffic evaporation', whereby motorists find other routes and presumably other modes of transport to get where they need to. Stop providing them with incentives to get into their cars. Recognise also the increasing amounts of commercial traffic on London's residential streets - this needs more strict regulation, particularly in light of the burgeoning use of traffic apps which bring commercial vehicles onto all kinds of unsuitable areas: surely we need legislation to limit use of these apps by HGVs and perhaps even vans.

Thank you for your attention to these extremely important concerns.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click here

<<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/5jIuA3NfI13GX2PQPOMvUnWT5wH6X0A!DDDqMPrhvV3r0MTtqiXXWGhK154AiSBIG4i22P8zz+KZtQUzGWYsdQ==>> to report this email as spam.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 11 August 2017 12:55

To: Transport Committee

Subject: re: Walking & Cycling at Outer London Junctions - ref Brentford/Kew Bridge Junction

I have a few comments to add to this investigation. Whilst I write mainly as a cyclist, virtually all of what I have to say will also apply to walking around the area, which I also do a lot.

I live in Brentford, and regularly commute to work in Shepherd's Bush, as well as local cycling all the way round the area.

From Brentford there are two major barriers for people to have to cross to leave the area cycling, or indeed walking; the A4/M4 to the north, and the Kew Bridge Junction/Chiswick Roundabout area heading east.

A4: there are very few 'nice' ways of crossing it for non motorised vehicles.

If heading north-west, the canal underpass is very useful, but otherwise the crossings at Boston Manor Road, Windmill Road, Ealing Road and Clayponds Ave are all fraught with danger, as cars turning right of left seem to think they have priority over cyclists going in any direction. This latter point is particularly critical at Clayponds Ave. This crossing has the potential to be a reasonable crossing, but drivers tend to treat it like a roundabout crossing (as per Ealing Road) rather than the signalled crossroads it appears to be to me. I have seen dangerous near misses between vehicles too, where both vehicles going straight across and those turning right believe they have priority. If you take anything from this email, please address this junction with at least better, clearer signage.

Windmill Road again could be nice but is narrow and there is too much motorised traffic trying to use it - making it too dangerous for [even me!] to use unless I really have to.

All of the A4 junctions mentioned above could be addressed with safe crossing points of cyclists. Some provision is made for shared use for pedestrians and cyclists, which doesn't work at all at rush hour, and is messy/conflicting at other times. At least clear advanced stop lines for cyclists - and importantly, with phased lights so cyclists

can get across before the motorised traffic try to overtake.

Kew Bridge Junction: Chiswick Roundabout can be avoided by using Wellesley Road, but this throws cyclists out on to the dual carriageway to Kew Bridge. Heading west, cyclists need to get into - and occupy - the right hand lane towards the junction (avoiding traffic trying to turn across into Lionel Road - would be good to put central curbs in to prevent right hand turns here) in order to go straight on to Brentford. This is a repeated source of conflict where cars etc refuse to give us space. Many, many cyclists either walk through, cycle on pavements or hug the extreme left hand curbs through here, all of which have their own dangers & consequences on other users. I personally have experienced plenty of abuse and/or aggressive driving just for being in front of a vehicle, or where they want to be (often cars try to undertake at this point and then cut in where I am in the lane).

I am not a junction expert or designer - there are plenty out there - but again clear, and ideally segregated cycle routes through this junction - with advanced phases of cycle lights - would allow safe passage. At the moment there is too much taking my life in my hands, and assuming vehicle drivers will behave safely around me and respect my right to be on the road. The huge majority do, of course, but enough don't to make it a significant problem. Arrogant driving also seems to increase in the evening or early morning, where overall traffic is lighter and drivers think they can 'get away' with dangerous moves, cutting across lanes and jumping lights.

A bit of a diatribe, sorry, but you asked. Making clear, safe routes to Ealing, Chiswick and Richmond from Brentford, for example, would encourage local cycling. Even people who use their bikes within the area tell me it is 'too dangerous' to go beyond these major (psychological & physical) barriers I describe above.

I am more than willing to assist in any further discussions or consultations on the local area, please do contact me on this email address as required.

[REDACTED]

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click

<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/ug!usZ4dD7HGX2PQPOMvUgny0!6zNmYY9mEfngBXHqZw33J84DnN+oNEY+hoyYz5G4i22P8zz+L3KeH4!zzvzA==> to report this email as spam.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 10 August 2017 17:38

To: Transport Committee

Subject: How our streets and junctions can become more people-friendly

These questions are asked time and time again and the answer is always the same. Therefore I do wonder now why these questions are being asked yet again.
Advice and design guidance is readily available. There have been plenty of surveys and studies, and plenty of excellent blogs.

The key is to prioritise walking and cycling instead of motor traffic. At the moment they are both marginalised. Design streets around walking and cycling not around motor vehicles. Use the experience of Holland and Denmark.

Pedestrians and cyclists need separate space and both need to be separated from motor vehicles. Where they cannot be separated they need to be the primary users, relegating motor vehicles as secondary users.

How can we enable more people to walk and cycle?

1. Prioritise walking and cycling. At present motor traffic is prioritised hence not many walk or cycle.
2. The reason not more people cycle is because road conditions are regarded too hostile. Until conditions are made safe more people won't cycle.
3. Walking is also unpleasant and often hostile eg crossing the road is difficult

How can we make our streets and junctions less hostile to people getting around by bike and on foot?

1. Use examples from Holland
2. Listen to people who cycle or walk.
3. Crossings need to be direct and on straight desire lines not awkward routes.
4. Cyclists need to keep moving as far as possible. It takes human energy to enable a 30lb or more bike to reach cycling speed.
5. Avoid multiple crossings eg shepherding people to an island to have to make another crossing or crossing in many stages.
6. Consider possibility of diagonal crossings.
7. Traffic signals should be more responsive to walkers when directly crossing the road and not have the almost mandatory delay of 30-40 seconds. It could be tried on an experimental basis.
8. Cyclists and pedestrian requirements should be separated and made obvious.
9. Cyclists should not have to share lanes with buses taxis or motor cycles. This is intimidating and doesn't ease flow for cyclists or buses.
10. Pedestrians normally can use pavements, but even this choice is removed by allowing pavement parking in some roads of outer London Boroughs.

How do you get all road users on board?

If you mean how can motor traffic continue to enjoy its dominance, the inescapable fact is it cannot. I suspect this is the reason these questions are being asked because the answer is clear, but "unpalatable" especially to the taxi lobby. Mayor Khan has been reported as not allowing his daughters to cycle because it's too "dangerous" for them. Therefore roads need to be made safer so they can cycle.
Whatever the faults of Boris Johnson he rode a bike. He had direct experience of the problems. Mayor Khan too needs to ride a bike so he has first hand experience.
To date he appears to not have done anything to improve conditions for cycling, and it appears committee and questions is just another stalling action.

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click here

<<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/XQ2X!qfI+W!GX2PQPOMvUiYxGuQ0drTSGeAP!enNeUsiTj8LiTFeQOY0hNW!hb>

bwBFH3GV0NO4qzR1Lppn2zgQ==> to report this email as spam.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 August 2017 15:51
To: Transport Committee
Subject: Outer London junctions

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear all,

I'd like to highlight four horrible junctions; in Charlton, Greenwich, Catford and Deptford. It is unclear what counts as "outer London", but these are all examples of outdated and dangerous design.

A206 Woolwich Road/ Charlton Church Lane/ Anchor & Hope Lane, Charlton

<<https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@51.487548,0.0313825,17z>>

<https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@51.487548,0.0313825,17z>

Woolwich Road - turned into a dual carriageway in the 1990s - is a formidable barrier between residential communities and the retail parks and River Thames to the north. There are only crossings on three sides, but buses deposit people on the side without a crossing, and most people take their lives into their hands and cross there anyway. If you want to take a bus to North Greenwich tube station, you have a choice of three stops on three sides of this crossing - hence the local nickname "dance of death" for this junction. It's hopeless trying to cycle down to the river here, Anchor & Hope Lane is a dual carriageway (with a roundabout further up) - the A206 as a whole between east Greenwich and Woolwich is a barrier to both cycling and walking. Plans to run Cycle Superhighway 4 through here have been shelved by Sadiq Khan. Classic terrible junction design (and if you follow Anchor and Hope Lane and then Bugsbys Way to Greenwich Peninsula, there's much more to come), exacerbated by rat-running down Charlton Church Lane to the retail parks (an issue that affects other streets in Charlton, including my own).

A206 Woolwich Road Flyover, Greenwich

<<https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@51.4863989,0.0180144,17z>>

<https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@51.4863989,0.0180144,17z>

A

<http://www.newsshopper.co.uk/news/8908517.Cyclist_died_in_mystery_accident_at_exceptionally_dangerous_junction/> cyclist died here in 2009. Travelling east to west is dangerous - there is no room for cyclists to move safely.

West to east is plain scary. If you walk, you have to navigate this to the south if heading east-west or west-east. Junction last remodelled in late 1990s - pedestrians were routed *across* the roundabout for a few years before TfL/Greenwich realised nobody wanted to walk this way. Was due for improvement as part of CS4, but this has been shelved by Sadiq Khan. Likely to worsen with extra Silvertown Tunnel traffic. Nobody seems to care.

A205 Brownhill Road and St Mildred's Road/ Verdant Lane/ Hither Green Lane

<<https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@51.4453166,0.0045014,19z>>

<https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@51.4453166,0.0045014,19z>

A good example of the contempt pedestrians are held in. There is no proper crossing for pedestrians on the western side of the junction, and on the eastern side the light phasing means waits of two minutes or more to cross the road. Pedestrians from Verdant Lane seeking to cross here often catch a 160 bus for one stop (from Sandhurst Road to Parkcroft Road) to avoid this junction. There is a large gap between eastbound bus stops here which exacerbates the problem for anyone wishing to take a 202 service. Not pleasant by bike either. Just horrible.

A2 Deptford Bridge, Deptford Broadway/ A2209 Deptford Church Street/ A2210 Brookmill Road

<<https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@51.4746374,-0.0236672,17z>> <https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@51.4746374,-0.0236672,17z>

TfL recently "upgraded" this junction. In June, <<https://www.standard.co.uk/news/london/deptford-bridge-crash-woman-dies-after-being-hit-by-cement-truck-in-south-east-london-a3565366.html>> a woman was hit by a cement truck and killed. It's still completely unappealing for cyclists, who have to rely on paint on the road for protection. It's

hard to see what has improved here, apart from TfL's ability to craft press releases.

Finally, two junctions that could benefit from diagonal crossings/ X-crossings as seen at Balham and Oxford Circus. These both have confusing light phases, and are both in locations where pedestrians should be able to assert themselves.

Torridon Road/Sandhurst Road, Catford

<https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@51.4420683,-0.0018769,19z> Two smaller roads but heavily used by buses. This has a light phase that sees all pedestrian movements possible at once - this would be a good place for an X-crossing so pedestrians can safely make diagonal movements across the road, especially after alighting from buses.

A210 Eltham High Street/ A208 Court Road and Well Hall Road, Eltham

<<https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@51.4509792,0.0523667,17z>>

<https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@51.4509792,0.0523667,17z>

Just been revamped as part of a TfL-funded public realm improvements programme. This has a light phases that sees all pedestrian movements possible at once - but no diagonal crossing. Seems a real waste. In general, reviewing Greenwich Council's work here could be of benefit - bus stops have been replaced by car parking (at least unofficially) and the surfaces are already not being looked after. There has also been local concern about

<<http://www.itv.com/news/london/2017-07-27/love-it-or-hate-it-hollywood-style-sign-in-eltham-divides-opinion/>> money being spent on large placemaking signs without consultation.

I hope this is useful to you.

Best wishes,

[Redacted signature]

--

<http://www.darrylchamberlain.co.uk>

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click here

<<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/oVPWMDmW233GX2PQPOMvUnWT5wH6X0A!jCs7KkcY5MmsB8weqlm3U2hK154AiSBIBFH3GVoNO4qqE4naC2k80A==>> to report this email as spam.

From: [Redacted]

Sent: 10 August 2017 14:17

To: Transport Committee

Subject: Walking and Cycling at outer London junctions

Follow Up Flag: Follow up

Flag Status: Flagged

Are there lessons to be learned from previous junction improvements?

- Wider junctions with count down timers allow people to cross in time and stops those on foot coming into conflict with those on bikes.

How can we enable more people to walk and cycle?

In my specific area of Kingston these have worked:

1. School policies of encouraging parents to walk, cycle or take public transport (buses) with their children to school coupled with residents parking that is enforced by 3-4 parking wardens randomly through the year at school start/end time. Due to having my car blocked in like other residents there are now residents parking in place. With this being enforced and schools encouragement to not use cars the majority of children are not driven to school.
2. More crossings where people want them - I live on a road which has 2 primary schools of side streets. Parents decided there were not sufficient crossings so painted in two zebra crossings. The council removed them so the parents repainted them. Eventually the council conceded and made the crossings permanent.
3. 20 MPH speed restrictions with sufficiently narrow roads to enforce it - The roads around the school have 20mph speed restrictions. If there are parked cars these speed restrictions are obeyed naturally, however if they aren't they are ignored.

How can we make our streets and junctions less hostile to people getting around by bike and on foot?

- Lines and other parking boxes to prevent vans, large 4x4s and trucks from parking near junctions. This will improve visibility for everyone.
- One way streets. There are some "Home Zone" streets in Kingston e.g. Manorgate Road that can be scary to cross in peak times due to:
 - a. Large vans parked blocking visibility around them
 - b. Cars ignoring 20mph zone and speeding
 - c. Layout of parking meaning it is hard to cross the road to avoid a car if it suddenly comes
 - d. Traffic being two way. There are sufficient streets so a few of them can be one way.
- Get rid of staggered crossings. There is one outside Asda and Boots on London Road. I have watched adults on their own, adults with their bikes and adults with children of various ages walk straight across the road near the crossing rather than use it as it is staggered.

How do you get all road users on board?

Making the infrastructure across boroughs a good standard. There are some parts of each borough that are horrible to cycle and walk in due to the lack of cycling infrastructure and poor/non-existent pavements. If you are going to such a part of a borough then for your own self-preservation you are not going to cycle or walk. For example I won't cycle on Durnsford Road in Merton due to how the road is laid out.

Ensuring by law there are proper alternatives when rail engineering works happen. There is currently engineering

works at Waterloo so my local train station, Norbiton, is completely closed through August. It is currently raining very heavily and if I have to go out I will drive. Engineering works also occur on Sundays but normally there are bus replacement services this time there are none for us, and talking to other people in the area most of them have resorted to using their cars to get to work as they can't go on holiday for the entire month and not everyone can work at home.

Making sure there is sufficient secure bike parking at all train stations. I have had to get myself a cheap bike of a family member to get quickly to the nearest train station with the most alternative routes which is Richmond. I cannot use the bike I have as due to it's cost it will definitely get stolen.

kr,

[REDACTED]

--

[REDACTED]

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click here

<<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/GfzLqoYpz9fGX2PQPOMvUtzroFmuoUEuPYjjPJj+FZHaZBI3752jSoNEY+hoyYz5BFH3GV0NO4ohei1KLnaPDA==>> to report this email as spam.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 10 August 2017 11:38

To: Transport Committee

Subject: RE: "London Assembly investigation: Walking & Cycling at Outer London Junctions"

Follow Up Flag: Follow up

Flag Status: Completed

Comments (from me as an individual) in green below questions below.

Happy to discuss in more detail if needed.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

"London Assembly investigation: Walking & Cycling at Outer London Junctions"

London Assembly says:

Our investigation

What different approaches could TfL and London boroughs take to improve junctions and increase walking and cycling in Outer London?

First, driver behaviour has to be modified, by a combination of enforcement and education, so that cyclists feel safe on carriageways. The close overtaking initiative is an important part of this.

Driver behaviour is not hard to change. Once drivers stop scaring cyclists, potential cyclists may be able to assess the risk of cycling more realistically.

Small pockets of improvement don't change the fact that most London streets are dominated by traffic and noise. They are hostile places even to step out into for a pint of milk.

Speed reduction is a big part of this. Average speed cameras are the best way to make it happen. Where there's space to overtake cyclists safely, 30 is slow enough, but 35-40 isn't, so 30 limits have to be strictly enforced.

On behalf of the London Assembly Transport Committee, Caroline Russell AM is investigating how our streets and junctions can become more people-friendly.

Get involved

There are a number of specific questions the Committee is seeking to answer. Please address any questions where you have relevant views and information to share, and feel free to cover any other issues you would like the Committee to consider.

Are there lessons to be learned from previous junction improvements?

Segregation of cyclists from motor traffic at major junctions delays everyone's journey, because extra phases have to be built into the signal cycle. TfL Buses resist this, as it discourages bus use, and cyclists find ways to save time by ignoring segregation or red lights.

How can we enable more people to walk and cycle?

Help them to assess the risks accurately, and improve journey times. Modes of transport are in competition, and speed is a major factor in the mode people choose.

Upgrade and improve walking and cycling routes that are not alongside roads. Create new connections across barriers such as railway lines, and ensure that routes cross main roads safely and with little delay.

Install more zebra crossings on desire lines. Ensure that pedestrian routes at major junctions are direct.

How can we make our streets and junctions less hostile to people getting around by bike and on foot?

Reduce private motor traffic so that more time can be given to pedestrians at junctions and crossings without delaying buses. Persuade cycling organisations that sharing with buses is acceptable. This will require excluding motorcycles, and ideally also taxis, from bus lanes, and ensuring that bus drivers are trained properly. Bus drivers must understand that bullying or endangering cyclists will put their careers at risk.

Lane widths need to be carefully chosen so that drivers are not tempted to overtake cyclists when there isn't room to do so.

Instead of complete segregation, cyclist pre-signals should be used much more to give a degree of time segregation, especially where roads are too narrow for drivers to overtake cyclists safely (e.g. narrow bridges).

Widen footways and prevent footway parking where pavements are too narrow, even if this means car parking spaces are lost.

How do you get all road users on board?

I think drivers are beginning to realise that separate facilities for cyclists delay all road users. They need to trade better behaviour for less delay. Most drivers are comfortable with unusually bad driving being punished severely. The chance of drivers losing their licenses if they endanger others must be increased to a level where drivers believe it could happen to them. Special pleading to keep a license due to needing it for work must end. Anyone that desperate to stay on the road can hire a driver for the duration of their ban.

Please email transportcommittee@london.gov.uk by August 11 and share the investigation on Twitter using #OuterLondonJunctions

Key Facts

The Mayor and TfL are promoting walking and cycling as a form of active travel and a way to reduce health inequalities - however, currently, over 40 percent of Londoners fall short of the recommended 150 minutes of activity per week.

TfL research has found that people who live in Outer London tend to walk less than those who live in Inner London. Public transport coverage is lower and car ownership is higher in Outer London, with cars making up a larger share of journeys. In particular, people who live in Outer London are less likely to walk children to school, walk to see friends or relatives, and walk to pubs, restaurants and cinemas.

In 2015:
53 percent of Inner Londoners walked at least five journeys a week, compared to 35 percent of Outer Londoners
47 percent of Inner Londoners walked as part of longer journeys on other forms of transport at least five times a week, compared to 41 percent of Outer Londoners

Disclaimer: This email and any attachments to it are intended solely for the person to whom it is addressed. It may contain confidential or sensitive material and should be handled accordingly. If you have received this email or any of the information in it in error, or if you are not the intended recipient, you must not disclose, distribute, copy or print any of it, and all copies must be deleted from your system. Please notify the sender immediately. Whilst we take reasonable steps to identify software viruses, any attachments to this email may contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. No liability is accepted for such viruses, and we therefore recommend that you carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any attachments. Information contained in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

The content of this email and any attachment transmitted within are confidential and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this email in error, please notify the sender and delete this message along with any attachments immediately. Unauthorised usage, disclosure, copying or forwarding of this email, its content and/or any attachments is strictly forbidden.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept by Mimecast for the presence of computer viruses.

www.mimecast.com

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click here

<<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/+V8QL6!dpMzGX2PQPOMvUrikelaf+VTnOuC5FxbCUwpqtN+93PtB+UzuJnqwN157BFH3GV0NO4rDexT6npRA1w==>> to report this email as spam.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 03 August 2017 20:38
To: Transport Committee
Subject: Outer London Junctions

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Assembly Transport Committee,

Regarding the Outer London Junctions report, I have a variety of suggestions regarding what the issues and opportunities are regarding problem junctions, and how improvements could be made and funded. I work in the policy team at the LB Redbridge planning department, and therefore am aware of specific examples and issues within my borough, although I am writing this in a personal capacity.

Regarding the individual questions -

1. Junction improvements internationally have worked best where clear paths for all road users are considered at the initial design stage, and simple materials and functionality have been prioritised. It is far easier to go back and improve the materials with a good layout, than fix a layout constructed with the most aesthetically pleasing materials possible.

It is important that they have been optimistic as to future non motorised flows and usage, and can be tied in with some other nearby change - eg improvements to nearby bus / rail services and residential development.

Gants Hill is a good example of this - whilst still of modest quality for cycling, the overall improvement in providing at grade pedestrian crossings was good enough to support the nearby residential development within the Area Action Plan.

Elsewhere, a good intervention has been to channelize traffic more and a reduction in the use of "stacking" lanes at signalised intersections. Whilst this does inhibit capacity to some extent, by reducing the number of through lanes and moving turning traffic to a different path, the resultant reduction in the overall "conflict area" between different paths of traffic allows for shorter intergreen times; and can also release road space for the introduction of cycling facilities. Whilst British junctions are generally more channelized than in many other countries, the opportunities presented by realignment are rarely fully utilised, and to retrofit cycling facilities is then deemed too expensive once the kerblines and drainage have already been altered. Often all that happens is that new "pinch points" are introduced where the cyclist is expected to be used as human traffic calming on an otherwise high speed road!

In this respect, it may be possible to turn other low quality junctions into hubs for residential densification and transit oriented development (especially where there is an existing rail or tube line), on the basis that the existing amenity value at certain large roundabouts is likely to be quite low, with developer contributions paying for the junction improvements. Potential locations for this could include, for example, the Hanger Lane gyratory, Staples Corner, Hillingdon tube station, and Northwick Park roundabout. Examples exist closer to central London such as at Queens Park and at Lea Bridge Road / Orient Way. I am aware that some of these have already been identified as development opportunities, however TfL could play a supportive role in providing additional funding and identifying where it would be easiest to mitigate any transport impacts.

There are additional "second tier" junctions that are not such formidable barriers, but certainly have localised severance and congestion issues as well as representing dicy environments for cyclists - Fullwell Cross roundabout in Barkingside would be an example.

2. This has been a mixed bag - in general schemes with "cycling" in their name have been better, especially in Inner London with very high quality examples along the more recent Superhighways. Schemes in outer London have

generally been adequate for walking but very poor for cycling - a good example of a missed opportunity is at Henlys Corner where the improved pedestrian facilities are welcome, but the route for cyclists is unclear and places them into conflict with pedestrians, and then across the junction ejects cyclists onto the carriageway in a very awkward fashion just as traffic lanes are merging together!

On other occasions, the opportunity is missed because it is not seen - because it is not a "cycling and walking" scheme and there is no incentive, time, or budget to make any further intervention. Making the Abbott Road underpass (crossing the A12 Blackwall Tunnel Northern Approach) one way could have freed up space for cycling, but instead it was just hatched out, with buildouts creating pinch points for any cyclist who does brave this route.

It must also be stated that the Olympic Park, whilst theoretically a blank canvass for prototyping new types of junction improvements, has in fact been rather poor for cycling provision [especially at the junctions, given a fatal incident on the Eastway where a 180 degree left turn exists to access the A12]. Expert guidance and scrutiny is required to ensure that network and detail road design at Old Oak Common is able to produce high quality examples of cycling provision [in particular] that could be replicated elsewhere.

3. This is not entirely clear but in some instances schools will have more children cycling to them from certain directions than others, depending on the facilities available on different routes away from the school.

4. A low cost intervention that would improve many junctions is to mark more them for two-stage right turns for cyclists - in most cases the pedestrian crossing is set back far enough from the junction to facilitate this, and a far side secondary signal already exists. This may also allow cyclists to turn right where it is presently a banned turn, and avoids potential conflict from using pedestrian / shared use crossings to make such turns.

Additionally more cycle contraflow lanes may allow cyclists to avoid some junctions more easily, especially in town centres. Often one way streets in residential areas were implemented to deter rat running around the major junctions this report seeks to investigate, and effectively forces cyclists through them.

5. Poor quality pavements [narrow in places, parked cars, disrepair], cycle infrastructure non-existent inadequate for the nature of the road / interrupted; interrupted pedestrian journeys due to poor side road junctions and lack of consideration at roundabouts in particular, indirect routes due to poor street layout and failure to link up adjoining sites.

6. Improved orbital routes would be a significant measure. Whilst a lot of emphasis in regard to increased capacity and housing delivery is understandably on radial capacity into central London [and the role cycling can play in alleviating this], many people's travel patterns mean that it is often quicker and easier to travel from their house in outer London to Oxford Circus by public transport, than to the opposite side of the same borough. The success of the Overground - which largely consists of an orbital route in zone 2 and other quasi-orbital routes beyond - demonstrates that cycling routes facilitating outer to outer London journeys would cater to a large demographic that is largely reliant on the bus or private car.

Sorting out roundabouts would be advantageous as well. Too many junctions have unradiused 90 degree turns for cycling routes, staggered crossings, and long detours to navigate large roundabouts, which slows down cyclists considerably and adds to walking distances. Compare this NL roundabout <<https://goo.gl/maps/k4iA4KJtTfJ2>> with this relatively new UK one <<https://goo.gl/maps/X9E3CpSdGtp>> . To be clear, mistakes are still being made when a blank canvas exists such as at North Greenwich, because the relevant design manuals do not adequately address such issues.

7. A relatively simple operation that would improve walking, and in particular cycling, would be to upgrade

existing service roads along arterial roads and/or restore cycleways originally installed when first built, and give them priority over side roads, with appropriate interventions (humped crossings, mandatory turns for motor traffic to prevent rat running, etc). The emphasis would be on linking these relatively isolated routes together and ensuring that they worked in an adequate basis (the design principle should be a "bus priority route for cyclists" in regard to priority, speed, capacity, general look and feel, etc).

Roads suitable for such an intervention include the A10 Great Cambridge Road, parts of the A406 North Circular Road, A3 Kingston Bypass, and A4020 Uxbridge Road. In many cases there is already a marked cycle route or track of some description, but often the provision loses continuity or protection at junctions and bus stops. Further information can in many cases be found from Carlton Reid's Kickstarter campaign, where the history of many "lost" 1930s cycleways along arterial roads is documented.

Further space can be sought by reassessing roads with lots of hatching, or that have been bypassed at some point in recent history.

Improved design standards are also necessary as many "interventions" are not led by walking or cycling officers, but are instead necessary off site measures for access to new developments etc. Use of the Highways England IAN 195/16 alongside existing TfL documentation would be helpful on major arterial roads in outer London that have high volumes and higher speeds.

8. Notionally yes, however this is usually in an attempt to avoid more difficult decisions regarding motor traffic, such as with shared use pavements that are of an inadequate width, staggered crossings. Build-outs and traffic islands are a frequent occurrence on London roads and in the context of busier outer London roads, are often very hazardous to cyclists who will spend more time looking over their shoulder anticipating a dangerous overtake, than watching for pedestrians trying to cross. Alternatives such as having longer crossing times for pedestrians would be used in other countries to conserve road width for cycle tracks, but they would result in a longer cycle time and so are generally not seen.

9. Cycling infrastructure should also be built for, and be fit for purpose and feel safe for, users of mobility scooters, and the Assembly Transport Committee should lobby for mobility scooters to be legally allowed in cycle lanes / on cycle tracks at their "on road" top speed of 8 mph, whereas technically they are banned at present. This would encourage age related and disability groups to support cycling infrastructure as it would directly benefit their users.

Changes to junctions that improve and clarify paths through junctions, reduce merging after junctions, simplify road layouts, etc. will also benefit motorists.

10. There should be a presumption in favour of separation from pedestrians in instances where on road provision is not suitable, that should only be relaxed if the pavement is effectively built to cycleway standards with very low flows of pedestrians expected outside a commercial or residential area (such as in the Metropolitan Green Belt), or for very short minor links; as well as a presumption that where shared use or segregated pavements are provided alongside on road cycle lanes and/or ASLs, neither cycle facility is good enough, and the effective width of both should be "consolidated" into a single, high quality facility.

A very poor example of a cycle route is the southern edge of Queens Square in Bristol <<https://goo.gl/maps/csPbzHxzRAY>> - with very faint cycle symbols on small tiles on the kerb, inconsistency between the markings and the signage, and a deliberate attempt to avoid any kind of visual contrast whatsoever. All of which is a disaster for the visually impaired. At one meeting of the Bristol Cycle Forum, a visually impaired person expressed his frustration when walking to work along this route - and all the cyclists effectively sympathised with him and said they were frequently fobbed off.

In this particular case, allowing two way cycling along the street with a smooth path along the cobbled surface would

have been better. Presumably these designs are intended to keep the letters pages of local newspapers full of complaints, rather than actually function in a meaningful way.

Visually contrasting cycle ways and kerbs are often thought to be incompatible with good visual / urban design, however the smooth, continuous ribbon of light red tarmac in the Netherlands [which isn't always red] is surely better than a hodge-podge of signage? Compare this NL <<https://goo.gl/maps/i7dhhZPcTsJ>> grade separated junction with this UK one <<https://goo.gl/maps/s5EdhGBwo5G2>> . In any instance we are often talking about places with a high movement value and a lower place value.

Also, a revision of tactile paving is necessary - the "tram line" paving at the start of cycleways is a skid hazard for cyclists and is useless for the visually impaired as it actually goes the wrong way to detect easily with a stick- the direction of the markings for each type of road user should be swapped!

11. Vehicular capacity is the main issue in regard to sorting out junctions - rising traffic is like boiling a frog because it is a downward spiral that reinforces itself - unreliable bus services caused by congestion encourage people to save time by driving and add to that congestion! The only realistic way out is to "disregard" motor vehicle journeys below a certain threshold [eg 1.5 miles] when modelling new layouts, on the basis that if people complain about it taking 45 minutes to drive a mile, they should have just walked [and the improvements would mean those who can't walk that car can cycle or use a mobility scooter]

12. Spending should be prioritised on a balance of:

- * Ability to improve safety - funding on schemes in each borough should be apportioned based in part on the risk per journey for cyclists and pedestrians - as whilst absolute numbers of cycling casualties in outer London are low, analysis by Rachel Aldred suggests that the risk of injury to individuals when cycling is up to 10 times as great in some boroughs as others, and some very dangerous junctions will not have many casualties as they are so off-putting.

- * Ability to improve accessibility - with an emphasis on improving access to community facilities and local retail centres rather than shaving a minute or two off journey times. Whilst much of the debate is around commuting, it is residents who either work [or study] in other parts of outer London, work in their own locality, or who do not work at all, who will spend the most time dealing with poor junctions in outer London.

- * Ability to unlock development opportunities. Many of the most problematic outer London junctions are already well served not only by car, but also by bus, tube, and/or rail - however having to cross busy roads with poor facilities inhibits the ability for such places to be convenient interchanges. However, at the moment many of the worst outer London junctions have a low-density, car based development pattern with regard to adjoining retail parks etc - typical adjoining uses being supermarkets, car showrooms, business parks and so on. Improvements to cycling and walking infrastructure can facilitate the remodelling of these sites to provide additional housing above rebuilt retail units, and an improved urban form and layout.

Gants Hill roundabout, as previously mentioned, would be a good example of this, and there are other places in outer London where a similar built form could be replicated around an existing junction, although not all have the benefit of a tube or rail connection. Such development would be able to be built with less parking, allowing for reduced build costs [due to the cost of providing underground parking] and at higher densities.

In some cases there is less potential for intensification around a junction, but improved crossing facilities are still essential for development - eg at the A12 Eastern Avenue / B177 Barley Lane junction, where the land at the north east corner of the junction has been allocated in the emerging Redbridge Local Plan; but the junction has no pedestrian signals and no cycling infrastructure.

Additionally, inadequate crossings are a frequent cause for objections to development near junctions (Charlie Brown's roundabout being a good example). Improving pedestrian and cycling provision can ensure better and safer access for

new and existing residents to local facilities.

13. Yes, given the scale of the issue and the importance of improving problem junctions to achieving the modal share targets in the draft Mayor's Transport Strategy. However one should note the ability of improvements to be paid for at least in part by the development which they would facilitate.

Regards

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click here

<<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/Ccqt5yVA6T3GX2PQPOMvUmuFhuAgpUQ2TpEcp+Ko+uKzg9MbKEqt+eY0hNW!hbbwmEHqD9oKBSCg1M3YVHc55g==>> to report this email as spam.

From:

Sent: 01 August 2017 21:15

To: Transport Committee

Subject: "Walking and cycling at Outer London junctions"

Follow Up Flag: Follow up

Flag Status: Flagged

Hi,

I live in Bromley and am responding to your invitation for views etc on walking, cycling and junctions in outer London.

I'm a married father of 3 secondary age children. We have a car, lots of bikes and use public transport most days. I cycle most days, but we use the car a lot as well. The rest of the family rarely cycle, despite being fit, as they don't feel safe on the roads.

Junctions is one factor here as they are often intimidating to novice cyclists. Traffic speed is another factor; again this can be intimidating.

Walking and cycling should be made a "tempting" way of travelling, that people choose to do to get from A to B. As soon as it feels scary, people won't do it. For example my wife won't cycle 5 minutes to the shops because the junctions near Bromley South scare her. I cycle that way most days and have got used to it but it's intimidating. Doing it with my children is out of the question and there is no alternative route.

Currently the road layouts result in high volumes of traffic at rush hour with a feeling of priority to cars over cycling and walking. Out of rush our traffic speeds increase and there is regular speeding, including around bends and junctions where people might be crossing. A complaint of some elderly neighbours is being half way across when speeding vehicles approach around a corner.

On a bike you often feel that you are "in the way" as there is no segregation, advance filtering etc. Existing cycle routes are often designed such that cyclists going straight on have to give way to traffic at side roads (see the A21 Bromley Common as a classic example).

Having cycled a lot in London, and also Barcelona and France, some suggestions...

* A good place to start would be routes to schools and train stations as these might have the best pent up demand

for more cycling and walking.

- * Ensuring that the routes are joined up, and don't fragment at crucial junctions.
- * Greater use of 20mph zones, particularly to avoid rat runs and speeding in residential areas.
- * More pedestrian crossings near stations and schools, giving clear priority to pedestrians in built up areas.
- * Road markings that make clear that cyclists have a right to be there, including safe overtaking width markings.
- * Advance stop boxes are good and though often ignored, are a reminder for people to expect bikes to be on the road.
- * Advanced green lights for cyclists
- * Consideration should also be given to trying to make cycle routes direct. In Bromley for example the recommended cycle route through the centre takes you alongside the main dual carriageway next to heavy traffic, rather than straight up to the high street. Not very inviting and hence little used.
- * Floating parking bays where the cycle way is between the pavement and parked cars as these feel much safer and are popular around the globe.

There will undoubtedly be challenges as some protest that this is anti-car. However, there is plenty of evidence from around the world that this is a good way of dealing with air pollution, obesity/diabetes, etc so political leadership will be needed to continually reinforce that the benefits outweigh the perceived costs.

Ultimately I think we should say that we want to make it preferable for people to walk or cycle, given the many benefits to society this would have. I suggest this means controlling traffic speeds, prioritising safe crossings for pedestrians, and making safe space for cycling on the road. I'd suggest "success" is that we feel happy for our teenage children to cycle around on their own, on the road and that this is a normal way to get around.

regards,



This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click here

<<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/W7hKz50vMvfGX2PQPomvUnWT5wH6X0A!wSq54fw!tY+GZebuwr3axNWWtyr6fyBuSM8FXgoXYRNjDxGYc2QXWA==>> to report this email as spam.

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 25 July 2017 23:13
To: Transport Committee
Subject: Walking and cycling at outer London junctions

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi

I wish I could give a positive suggestion about this problem but one of the main issues that I see, is that of on street parking. I would guess that car ownership in outer London is far higher than in inner London. Ironically the more successful schemes to get people on to active travel , the worse the problem becomes.

On street parking is not only a deterrent to cycling but also makes hoppla bus routes almost impossible for the buses to negotiate. Council recycling centres, in the main , do not cater for pedestrian or cycle traffic neither do the large out of town retail parks. There is no incentive for people to relinquish their car ownership.

The proposal for quietways is excellent but all the artist's impressions seem to show single parking spaces for shared use cars. I just can't see residents getting on board with these schemes.

Commercial vehicles should not be allowed to park overnight in residential roads. when I'm out cycling, I often see parked vans and lorries obstructing the view of the road ahead, a nuisance for experienced cyclists but very daunting to someone new to cycling. Obviously many of these vehicles will have legitimate business reasons for parking in residential areas during the day but they should be left in the company's yard when not in use and not parked up at home.

There is a definite swing toward the understanding that cyclists are legitimate road users, helped by TFL , London mayor and cycling organisations but many outer London councils are just playing lip service to improving cycle facilities. Very easy to show how effective cycling can be when you can point to extremely well used and excellent cycle routes like CS6 but not so easy when trying it in boroughs like Sutton.

Thank you for your time and effort to improve our cycling facilities.

[REDACTED]

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click

<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/L!gVeD6nSX3GX2PQPOMvUtA0Ix6yMtZJph7rOjmGZhSyXMaG846wduIl8llzrITW6eN7GuMFmZAlVq5uz6AOA==> to report this email as spam.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 July 2017 08:24
To: Transport Committee
Subject: Improving facilities for pedestrians.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Traffic signal controlled pedestrian crossings:

At the moment the delay between the button being pushed and the lights changing can be very long. So nimble pedestrians don't fed up waiting and risking crossing 'unprotected'. This can mean that by the time the lights do change there is no-one there to cross so motorists perceive the lights as being an obstruction that helps nobody.

Example: the crossing outside the Catholic Church in Hanwell, W7.

(It was just such a situation that got Boris when he was mayor to complain to Ealing council about traffic signal controlled pedestrian crossings and we've got some idiotic roundabouts instead which are even more pedestrian hostile)

There is no pedestrian interval in the sequence for foot/cycle traffic crossing crossing Springfield Road at the junction with Springfield Road/Uxbridge Road in Hayes. This is a very busy junction in terms of both foot traffic, cycle traffic and motor traffic. During 'their' sequences few motorists show any consideration for foot/cycle traffic trying to cross - this is an example of prevalent problem making walking/cycling a difficult and dangerous choice.

Thanks for reading this far

Regards
[REDACTED]

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click here

<<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/Bgl9AOcAscrGX2PQPOMvUr11KAWLA5a3seciYFyWaZmEOHJiRcJP+payu5pXUPZSTbL98DokuU5Ppv0P1Tfw+Q==>> to report this email as spam.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 19 July 2017 15:23

To: Transport Committee

Subject: Walking & Cycling at Outer London Junctions

Follow Up Flag: Follow up

Flag Status: Flagged

Hi

I am not a transport expert but I am a resident of Waltham Forest where the council has introduced many improvements to cycling and pedestrian experiences through its Mini Holland programme. I completely agree that London is dominated by traffic noise and pollution and I am very keen to see more efforts to reduce car use. I have a few comments as follows:-

How can we enable more people to walk and cycle?

Cyclists need more secure cycling parking both at home and away from home. Cycle hangars in residential streets are a great way of allowing people who live in flats or terraced houses to store their bikes when they don't have room at home. More people would consider getting a bike if they had somewhere to store it. Away from home, we need secure cycle hubs and/or CCTV monitoring of cycle parking. I am sometimes reluctant to take my bike out because I'm not sure if there will be anywhere safe to leave it at my destination.

How can we make our streets and junctions less hostile to people getting around by bike and on foot?

For cyclists, protected cycle lanes are great, and also protected intersections like these in Holland:

<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0VFRwU9QTDk>> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0VFRwU9QTDk>

Waltham Forest Council is currently planning to introduce these intersections at certain points on its main roads.

How do you get all road users on board?

In my experience, most opposition comes from car drivers. I think it helps to emphasise the positive effects of cycling/pedestrian improvements eg more people walking/cycling means fewer cars on the road so less congestion for essential car journeys. We also need education about the dangers of pollution (eg info about how drivers breathe in fumes from the exhaust of the car in front) and positive initiatives like "walk to school" or "walk to work" days. If we target school children and encourage them to walk to school, they may also have an influence on their parents' behaviour.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click here

<<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/Rqi!DZaPoYrGX2PQPOMvUizKrmxxhcEGow5gM!nJ4Rt2zhE0q8c0tvLTIU9jG1Wn19wNAeE4VddfcZxYauAECA==>> to report this email as spam.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 13 July 2017 03:28

To: Transport Committee

Subject: Walking & Cycling at Outer London Junctions

Follow Up Flag: Follow up

Flag Status: Flagged

How can we enable more people to walk and cycle?

How can we make our streets and junctions less hostile to people getting around by bike and on foot?

How do you get all road users on board?

Dear Caroline Russell AM,

If motor vehicles obeyed speed limits roads would be less scary for cyclists. To encourage the observance of speed limits, more cameras need to be used and fines imposed for breaches. Driving a motor vehicle needs to be viewed as a privilege, not a right.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click here

<<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/kUJmkDcCNP!GX2PQPOMvUizKrmxxhcEGXHLeI!QmlvIT64fmQl7kUIB+agpGgZC+!rMvojnMvSJOzrnJmt4uGw==>> to report this email as spam.

Strategies to effect long term reduction in traffic pollution In Brentford with a focus on the safety of the A4 Brentford stretch (GSK to Chiswick Roundabout) in general and the A4 junction with Windmill Road in particular.

At the recent Brentford Air Quality meeting (Jan 17th) I represented the locals schools in an attempt to persuade Hounslow Council and TfL to focus on reducing pollution around Our Lady & St. John and Lionel Road primaries, both sitting to the north-east of the M4 and A4 and within ¼ of a mile of these busy arterial routes. Almost **one thousand 3-10 year-olds** are subjected to greater than normal levels of pollution daily and a long-term plan (a combination of traffic reduction and ultra-low emission zoning) is urgently needed to mitigate the rising level of pollutants in the area.

Due to the pollution in this area and the danger inherent in crossing 6 lanes of fast traffic (it is commonplace here for motorists to block crossings, ignore red lights and exceed the speed limit) many parents drive their children to school rather than walk, adding significantly to the number of traffic journeys made in Brentford daily. (If only 10% of Brentford primary school parents use their car for the school run, it equates to 1700 more car journeys per week).

It is my view, both to encourage parents to walk to school and to ensure the safety of those of us who already do, the following recommendations should be seriously and crucially **immediately** evaluated by TfL:

1. Speed reduction from 40 to 20 mph on the Brentford Section of the A4- GSK to Chiswick roundabout. The installation of speed cameras to enforce this.
2. Increase awareness that there are four school crossings along this stretch- there is little or no road signage to warn drivers to slow down or at least stop checking their mobile phones at 40 mph while children are standing at the edge of the road to cross.
3. An urgent rephasing of the traffic lights allowing pedestrians to cross both carriageways quickly without having to sprint with small children/prams.
4. Installation of signs and/or cameras to prevent cars uniformly blocking the crossings and the boxed junctions.
5. An evaluation of the Windmill/A4 junction's fitness for purpose. Due to traffic volume it is no longer fit for purpose and is dangerous for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians. It is absolutely a matter of time before a pedestrian is seriously injured here.
6. A clean up of the A4 under the M4 flyover. Planting trees and making the journey across a little more appealing.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 June 2017 15:31
To: Transport Committee
Subject: Re: Walking & Cycling Outer London Junctions
Attachments: Planning networks for walking and cycling 220710.doc

Research
Refer attached

Sent with AquaMail for Android
<http://www.aqua-mail.com>

On 30 June 2017 14:41:05 wrote:

> Publications
> Refer attached
> <https://www.livingstreets.org.uk/resources?c=1188&q=pedestrian+pound>
>
> Strategic Plan
> <https://lcc.org.uk/pages/strategic-plan>
>
> Campaigns
> <http://www.cyclinguk.org/publication/cycle-campaign-news-cycledigest/campaign-news-april-2017>
> <http://stopthekilling.org.uk/direct-actions/10-by-2020-cycling-safety-challenge/>
> <http://www.makingspaceforcycling.org/>
>
> Consultation
> Refer attached 0116pdf
> <https://www.ice.org.uk/news-and-insight/policy/ice-submission-on-london-transport>
>
> Research
> <https://www.cycling-embassy.org.uk/wiki/research-docs>
>
> Views/Blogs
> <http://www.n21online.com/articles//item/cycle-lane-construction-has-your-life-been-blighted.html>
>
>
>
>
> Sent with AquaMail for Android
> <http://www.aqua-mail.com>

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click
<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/cxoBHoehOMTWQxILzJ5p91drBZKsZKkMmHyGrjX2YAROQJG9osCIRYEOECrfOZvtFhRr2Q4+rTjCYRG3cYvl5w==> to report this email as spam.

Sent: 30 June 2017 15:20

To: Transport Committee

Subject: Re: Walking & Cycling Outer London Junctions

Attachments: iia-appendix-1-other-plans-programmes.xls; A105-Economic-Impact-Assessment.pdf; HUDU-Rapid-HIA-Tool-3rd-edition-April-2017.pdf; Health-Inequalities-Impact-Assessment-on-LHC-recommendations1.pdf; TR010021-000225-6.8 Health and Equalities Impact Assessment.pdf

Local Authorities

refer attached x2

Urban Health

Refer attached

London Health Commission

Refer attached

NIP

Refer attached

Sent with AquaMail for Android

<http://www.aqua-mail.com>

> Publications

> Refer attached

> <https://www.livingstreets.org.uk/resources?c=1188&q=pedestrian+pound>

>

> Strategic Plan

> <https://lcc.org.uk/pages/strategic-plan>

>

> Campaigns

> <http://www.cyclinguk.org/publication/cycle-campaign-news-cycledigest/campaign-news-april-2017>

> <http://stopthekilling.org.uk/direct-actions/10-by-2020-cycling-safety-challenge/>

> <http://www.makingspaceforcycling.org/>

>

> Consultation

> Refer attached 0116pdf

> <https://www.ice.org.uk/news-and-insight/policy/ice-submission-on-london-transport>

>

> Research

> <https://www.cycling-embassy.org.uk/wiki/research-docs>

>

> Views/Blogs

> <http://www.n21online.com/articles//item/cycle-lane-construction-has-your-life-been-blighted.html>

>

>

>

>

> Sent with AquaMail for Android

> <http://www.aqua-mail.com>

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click

<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/zDBfIEXcu7rWQxILzJ5p97iumRH+e2bKvXaYvO4wmIEo8b+ca9m7eoEOECrfOZvtFhRr2Q4+rTjCYRG3cYvl5w==> to report this email as spam.

Sent: 30 June 2017 15:05
To: Transport Committee
Subject: Re: Walking & Cycling Outer London Junctions
Attachments: Cycling Plan.pdf

Refer attached

Sent with AquaMail for Android
<http://www.aqua-mail.com>

- > Publications
- > Refer attached
- > <https://www.livingstreets.org.uk/resources?c=1188&q=pedestrian+pound>
- >
- > Strategic Plan
- > <https://lcc.org.uk/pages/strategic-plan>
- >
- > Campaigns
- > <http://www.cyclinguk.org/publication/cycle-campaign-news-cycledigest/campaign-news-april-2017>
- > <http://stopthekilling.org.uk/direct-actions/10-by-2020-cycling-safety-challenge/>
- > <http://www.makingspaceforcycling.org/>
- >
- > Consultation
- > Refer attached 0116pdf
- > <https://www.ice.org.uk/news-and-insight/policy/ice-submission-on-london-transport>
- >
- > Research
- > <https://www.cycling-embassy.org.uk/wiki/research-docs>
- >
- > Views/Blogs
- > <http://www.n21online.com/articles//item/cycle-lane-construction-has-your-life-been-blighted.html>
- >
- >
- >
- >
- > Sent with AquaMail for Android
- > <http://www.aqua-mail.com>

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click

<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/QQlu031GvcXWQxILzJ5p9+Q!3dOhEa6cGGxE0m4K5913tR!CMxw21oEOECrfOZvtFhRr2Q4+rTjCYRG3cYvl5w==> to report this email as spam.

Sent: 30 June 2017 14:58

To: Transport Committee

Subject: Re: Walking & Cycling Outer London Junctions

Attachments: civitas_thematic_group_demand_management_-discussion_theme_spring_2014-jawel_0.pdf; better-streets-delivered-web-version.pdf; Kingston_Stage_II_V07c.pdf

Publications

Refer attached x 2

London LA

Refer attached x 2

<http://bromley-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/pslp/dlp?pointId=s1463670043854>

Sent with AquaMail for Android

<http://www.aqua-mail.com>

> Publications

> Refer attached

> <https://www.livingstreets.org.uk/resources?c=1188&q=pedestrian+pound>

>

> Strategic Plan

> <https://lcc.org.uk/pages/strategic-plan>

>

> Campaigns

> <http://www.cyclinguk.org/publication/cycle-campaign-news-cycledigest/campaign-news-april-2017>

> <http://stopthekilling.org.uk/direct-actions/10-by-2020-cycling-safety-challenge/>

> <http://www.makingspaceforcycling.org/>

>

> Consultation

> Refer attached 0116pdf

> <https://www.ice.org.uk/news-and-insight/policy/ice-submission-on-london-transport>

>

> Research

> <https://www.cycling-embassy.org.uk/wiki/research-docs>

>

> Views/Blogs

> <http://www.n21online.com/articles//item/cycle-lane-construction-has-your-life-been-blighted.html>

>

>

>

>

> Sent with AquaMail for Android

> <http://www.aqua-mail.com>

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click

<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/rwol8X4Hx!bWQxILzJ5p9+Q!3dOhEa6c9ElBVlbHoSKf1WGeR3GVw4EOECrfOZvtFhRr2Q4+rThJlvhZuck2Ig==> to report this email as spam.

Sent: 30 June 2017 14:41

To: Transport Committee

Subject: Walking & Cycling Outer London Junctions

Attachments: ciht_-_planning_for_cycling_proof_v2_singles.pdf; 0116_NIC Call for Evidence London_Sustrans response.pdf

Publications

Refer attached

<https://www.livingstreets.org.uk/resources?c=1188&q=pedestrian+pound>

Strategic Plan

<https://lcc.org.uk/pages/strategic-plan>

Campaigns

<http://www.cyclinguk.org/publication/cycle-campaign-news-cycledigest/campaign-news-april-2017>

<http://stopthekilling.org.uk/direct-actions/10-by-2020-cycling-safety-challenge/>

<http://www.makingspaceforcycling.org/>

Consultation

Refer attached 0116pdf

<https://www.ice.org.uk/news-and-insight/policy/ice-submission-on-london-transport>

Research

<https://www.cycling-embassy.org.uk/wiki/research-docs>

Views/Blogs

<http://www.n21online.com/articles//item/cycle-lane-construction-has-your-life-been-blighted.html>

Sent with AquaMail for Android

<http://www.aqua-mail.com>

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click

<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/daESTjL1YGfWQxILzJ5p90F7kgtQ06AXNu9rW6Z7TbNvsLRTxSSFa4EOECrfOZvtFhRr2Q4+rThJlvhZuck2Ig==> to report this email as spam.