

Committee(s):	Date(s):
Planning & Transportation Policy & Resources	10 March 2016 17 March 2016
Subject: North – South Cycle Superhighway between Stonecutter Street and King’s Cross – The City’s response to the public consultation	Public
Report of: Director of the Built Environment	For Decision
<p>Summary</p> <p>TfL, on behalf of itself and Islington and Camden is currently consulting on the Mayor’s north-south cycle superhighway between Stonecutter Street and King’s Cross and requires responses by 20th March 2016.</p> <p>There are significant local issues for the City of London. These include safety, lack of improvements for cyclists and pedestrians, impact on local users and the adverse impact on splitting the bi-directional cycle track at Stonecutter Street, This report therefore sets these out and provides a proposed response.</p> <p>Recommendation(s)</p> <p>Members are asked to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree the City’s response as detailed in Appendix 3. 	

Main Report

Background

1. In autumn 2014, TfL consulted on the Mayor’s east-west and north-south cycle superhighways. The proposals were endorsed for implementation in February 2015 by the TfL’s board. Also in February 2015, Members accepted, even though there were still significant concerns, the Mayor’s proposals and authorised officers to work with TfL to help facilitate the introduction of its schemes.

Current Position

2. Construction work on both schemes has progressed significantly with many sections now complete. The north-south scheme, north of Stonecutter Street, was however deferred whilst further discussions were concluded with Camden and Islington Councils so that part of the route was accommodated on their roads (to overcome the lack of space along Farringdon Road).
3. TfL, together with Camden and Islington Councils, is now consulting on the north-south cycle superhighway between Stonecutter Street and King’s Cross.

See Appendix 1 for further information. Detailed concept plans are provided in Appendix 2. Deadline for a response is 20 March 2016.

4. The revised proposals do not add any new material implications for the City and those set out in the October 2014 report still remain. However, there are a number of fundamental local concerns as well as questions regarding the bi-directional design principle adopted in the earlier scheme. These are all detailed in the next section of the report.

Key Issues

5. Farringdon Road north of Clerkenwell Road narrows significantly and would not be wide enough to accommodate bi-directional cycle lanes without significant implications such as closing the road to other traffic or land purchases. To overcome the width limitation, the Mayor has accepted that it would be appropriate to split the track so that the cycle lanes are on the same sides as the general traffic flow (with-flow) as well as separating the route. Local access and egress from side streets can be much easier to accommodate with with-flow cycle lanes but the level of service for cyclists is much reduced when compared to the bi-directional facility. For example it does not address the “left hook” collisions, where these may exist. It should be noted that the Streets and Walkways Sub-Committee has been considering in detail the access and egress implications at Tudor Street as a result of the bi-directional design.
6. In July 2015, the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee and the Projects Sub-Committee approved the cycle quietways network in the City and measures for public consultation. Quietways have been promoted by the Mayor to cater generally for the new or less confident cyclists. One of the routes connects to the north-south cycle superhighway at the Snow Hill junction but the proposals do not provide for a safe or convenient facility to interchange between the two routes (except for southbound cyclists).
7. The Farringdon Street/Snow Hill/West Smithfield junction is the 9th most dangerous location in the City of London (including TfL’s streets) with 18 injury collisions recorded in the last 3 years. It is joint second for collisions resulting in a fatality or serious injury. Of the 18 injury collisions, 11 involved pedal cyclists, 8 of which were to cyclists heading southbound on Farringdon Street. The proposals only provide protection for northbound cyclists already on the route but none for southbound cyclists. In fact the positioning of the bus stop to the north of the junction, further into the carriageway (to make room for the cycle bypass), will increase risks (due to reduced visibility) for traffic coming out of Snow Hill. It appears that the safety for cyclists and other road users at this junction has been overlooked.
8. The City has a target of reducing fatalities and serious injury by a third and a fifth on all injury collisions by 2016. If these targets are to be achieved, significant improvements must also be made on TfL’s network as collisions on its network account for approximately 50% all injury collisions in the City.
9. The interaction of the Smithfield Market and the composition of heavy goods vehicles using this area do not appear to have been properly considered. Through the promotion of cycle superhighway facilities, more cyclists will be

attracted to use the route. This will increase the conflict with HGVs, especially at the uncontrolled Snow Hill junction. Conflict at that junction needs to be designed out rather than ignored.

10. A safer and more convenient pedestrian crossing facility is needed at the Snow Hill junction as this is a key point for pedestrians. However, the proposal makes the provision for pedestrians even worse as the layout is complicated and offers reduced sightlines. It is highly likely that this proposal will increase the risks to pedestrians crossing in the area.
11. The footway on the east side (north of Snow Hill) is also being reduced by around 1 metre. The resultant width may not provide an adequate width for pedestrians, especially when more pedestrians are attracted to the area in the future as a result of redevelopments such as the Museum of London, Cross Rail, etc.
12. It is acknowledged that it is not feasible or appropriate for the bi-directional track to proceed along the whole route and the splitting the track would be necessary. However, there are strong concerns from a local stakeholder that splitting the track at Stonecutter Street would create conflicts with their employees as well as the design not fitting in with their aspirations for the area. Given the issues discussed above and combined with this, it would seem necessary that the location for splitting the track needs to be reconsidered either further north or south of the current location so that the most appropriate balance, in particular towards improving safety can be achieved.

The City's response

13. Given the significant local concerns raised above, it is appropriate to ask the Mayor to reconsider the proposals along Farringdon Street. A draft of the City's response can be found in Appendix 3.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

14. The cycle superhighways fully accords with the City's strategic and corporate policy objectives. The reduction in motor vehicles could deliver components of the Air Quality Strategy, the Climate Change Mitigation Strategy, the Health and Wellbeing Strategy and the Noise Strategy.

Conclusion

15. Cycle superhighways are supposed to provide significant safety as well as other benefits for cyclists but this does not appear to be the case for the proposals in the City.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – N-S Consultation leaflet
- Appendix 2 – N-S detailed consultation plans

- Appendix 3 – The City's draft response

Sam Lee

Team Leader, Department of the Built Environment

T: 020 7332 1921

E: sam.lee@cityoflondon.gov.uk