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Executive Summary

A total of 1936 responses were received to the consultation, made up of 1875 questionnaire responses and a further 61 written responses (emails/letters). The response rate for this consultation is significantly higher than most other consultations run by the Council, indicating the degree of importance that many residents and visitors to Westminster attach to cycling as an issue. It may also be linked to the prominence of cycling and cycle safety issues in London in the weeks leading up to the consultation, during which six cyclists were killed on London’s streets between Tuesday 5th November and Monday 18th November.

Respondent profile

67% of respondents to the consultation were male. There was a reasonable spread of ages within the 25-54 age group who made up 75% of responses. 25% of respondents were Westminster residents, 50% work in Westminster and much of the remainder pass through it. This profile mirrors that of the average cyclist within Westminster, and indeed 71% of respondents cycle at least once a week, a further 15% cycle once to three times a month and 13% never cycle. Those who do not cycle are more likely to be female, older and residents of Westminster.

Barriers and priorities

Of those who responded the most frequently cited barriers were lack of cycle route infrastructure (35%), safety (26%) and traffic volume / congestion (20%). Other common barriers were lack of cycle parking (13%) and road user behaviour (12%). Many of these barriers will be tackled by the proposed actions in the strategy.

In terms of the relative importance given to different objectives within the strategy, 98% considered making Westminster safer for road users to be important. 91% felt that it was important for the Council to help different road users get on better together (i.e. through improved enforcement and education/training). 63% felt that supporting residents to own and maintain their own bikes (through improved cycle parking, cycle hire etc) was important.

Safer and More Legible routes

Making improvements to road junctions/accident blackspots and introducing a central London Cycle Grid were considered to be the greatest priorities by respondents, by a considerable margin (82%, 74% and 64% respectively). There was a reasonable level of support for the proposed cycle grid routes, with 37% indicating support for the alignments, but only 12% suggesting it was unacceptable. When asked if they had other suggestions for creating safer routes, dedicated space for cycling and /or segregation was mentioned by 49% and actions to address inconsiderate road behaviour (such as increased enforcement and training/education) were also felt to be important. Other common suggestions included a desire to see lower speeds (including 20mph limits) amongst 12% of respondents, HGV restrictions (5%) and more Advanced Stop Lines (5%). A range of comments were made in relation to specific cycle grid routes.

Road user interaction
When asked to consider potential approaches that the Council could adopt in order to encourage good relationships among road users, those seen as important by the highest proportions of respondents were those that related specifically to the conduct of larger vehicles: just under two thirds (64%) of respondents felt that establishing a working relationship with TfL in order to provide training programmes for lorry drivers was among the three most important actions that the Council could take, while 59% felt that this was the case with regard to providing vehicle safety and cyclist awareness training for fleet drivers as part of council contracts. 57% felt that the rules of the road should be more strictly enforced. 56% felt that campaign work encouraging safer and more responsible sharing of the roads is important. These results are unsurprising given the timing of the consultation in relation to the spate of cyclists involved in serious/fatal collisions with HGVs. It is worth noting that only a fifth of respondents had undertaken any formal cycle training and almost 300 consultees said they would like to sign up for cycle training.

**Bike ownership and storage**

Respondents are very clear in terms of how they feel that the Council could best support residents in this regard: 84% felt that the provision of a greater number of secure facilities in which to store bikes was among the most important actions that the Council could take in order to facilitate bike ownership. This was followed by 43% of respondents who thought the promotion of cycle security and marking should be a priority. 31% of respondents thought that offering courses in bicycle maintenance was important, and 30% considered the expansion of cycle hire into the rest of Westminster an important action.

**Encouraging more people to cycle**

When asked to consider potential approaches that the Council could adopt in order to encourage cycling in the City, respondents were most likely to highlight the promotion of cycle to school schemes (58%), incentives to encourage people to cycle more regularly (51%) and campaigns (43%). A number of respondents commented that the Council should adopt a balanced approach when targeting people to take up cycling – i.e. not just focusing resources on the ‘near market’, but also those that are harder to reach who are more likely to reap greater benefits as a result.

**Amendments to the strategy**

A number of amendments have been made to the Cycling Strategy and Cycle Grid to reflect the comments made by consultees. These are summarised at the end of each of sections 4-7 of this consultation report.
1: Consultation details

This chapter of the report explains the background to the consultation on the Draft Westminster Cycling Strategy and the methodology used to run the consultation. It details the types and names of the organisations that were consulted; the publicity undertaken by the Council, the press coverage received and other engagement activities.

1.1 Background

1.1.1 For many years Westminster has developed policies and delivered schemes to support and encourage cycling as a mode of travel, in recognition of the health, air quality, economic and other benefits it can bring to individuals, the wider community and environment, as set out in the Westminster City Plan: Strategic Policies (November 2013).

1.1.2 As part of the City Council’s Better City Better Lives programme the Council committed to producing a walking and cycling strategy. However, it was decided that although these two modes of transport share many similarities they can have very different impacts on the built environment and can often conflict, especially on Westminster’s complex, busy, urban network. The growing number of people choosing to cycle within Westminster and the need to have a strategy that caters for this growth alongside the publication of the Mayor’s Vision for Cycling (launched in March 2013) therefore required a more local level response to cycling that takes account of Westminster’s unique circumstances and challenges. Westminster’s Draft Cycling Strategy sets out a ‘Vision for Cycling in Westminster’, explains how the Council intends to help deliver the Mayor’s Vision and is structured around four high level objectives; each with a series of actions to help deliver these objectives. Finally, a draft implementation plan and a monitoring plan are included.

1.1.3 In addition to informal consultation with a range of stakeholders, the Council ran a formal consultation on the draft Cycling Strategy from Tuesday 3rd December 2013 until 20th January 2014. This report provides an overview of the consultation activities undertaken by the Council, the responses received and how the Council will address the issues raised.

1.2 Methodology

1.2.1 The consultation materials included a suite of three main documents; the Draft Westminster Cycling Strategy, a set of supporting Appendices and a large plan showing the proposed Cycle Grid routes. A consultation summary and questionnaire was also produced to assist with the consultation (see Appendix 1).

1.2.2 These documents were published on the Council’s website at www.westminster.gov.uk/cyclingstrategy, where consultees could fill in an online survey. Hard copies of all documents were made available in all Westminster libraries. Additionally, hard copies of the consultation summary and questionnaires were also put on display in sports centres and other community venues.
1.2.3 The consultation was opened on 3 December 2013 and ran for seven weeks until 20 January 2014 when it closed. However, hard copy questionnaires and written responses were accepted until 24 January 2014. Late responses were accepted from two organisations, whose responses were considered to be of particular interest (TfL and the Royal Parks).

1.3 Promotion

1.3.1 On 3 December 2013 a link to the consultation document was emailed to a cross section of stakeholders with an interest in cycling in Westminster. A list of these organisations can be found in Appendix 2. All Westminster Members and Strategic Directors also received this email.

1.3.2 The Council put an article in the winter edition of the Westminster Reporter, with a half page article on the consultation alongside a feature on the Council’s cycle training programme.

1.3.3 The Council’s press office regularly posted tweets on the consultation, encouraging people to respond. All emails being sent by Council staff contained a link to the consultation in the footer. The consultation was also promoted on the staff intranet and external Council website.

1.4 Publicity

1.4.1 Most of the cycling groups/cycle bloggers picked up on the consultation and have written articles on it, published on their websites. Many organisations have also been promoting it to their staff and members. In terms of media it has been featured on BBC London TV and in all the local papers (West End Extra, Wood and Vale, London 24, Westminster Chronicle). A summary of the coverage received is provided in Appendix 3.

1.5 Meetings attended by officers during the consultation

1.5.1 During the lead up to the consultation officers attended all six Area Forums to raise awareness amongst residents of the forthcoming consultation on the strategy. Views
were sought on the key issues and actions contained within the strategy and the routes proposed to form part of the cycle grid. A common theme of discussion at most of the Area Forums was poor road user behaviour. For instance, cyclists who choose to cycle on footways and through red lights were a concern, and a number of proposals within the strategy were seen as key ways of tackling these issues. These included greater publicity of the Council’s cycle training programme, the cycle grid proposals, greater awareness of road rules by foreign visitors, and increased enforcement against all road users by the police. Similarly, cyclists were also concerned by the conduct of some motorists who they felt put their safety in danger, for instance by passing too close or encroaching into Advanced Stop Lines. Other topics discussed included improved maintenance of cycle routes and a desire to see increased levels of cycle parking. Officers also received some constructive suggestions in relation to the proposed cycle grid routes, including comments on the naming strategy for the routes, routes that were felt to be particularly valuable were highlighted, as well as any routes that were not supported or suggestions for new alternative alignments.

1.5.2 Once the consultation had been launched, officers gave presentations and answered questions at meetings with a number of groups including the Council’s Environment Policy and Scrutiny Committee Cycle Task Group, Business Improvement District representatives, the Westminster Property Association and the Westminster Amenity Societies Forum.

1.5.3 Where requested, officers have also met with residents groups and amenity societies, such as the Paddington Residents’ Active Concern on Transport (PRACT) and the Federation of Pimlico Residents Associations (FREDA), to discuss the proposed TfL Cycle Superhighway routes in their areas.
2. Profile of respondents to the consultation

2.0.1 A total of 1875 individuals responded to the consultation questionnaire. A further 61 written responses were also received from a mixture of individuals and organisations. It should be noted that the response rate for this consultation is significantly higher than most other consultations run by the Council, indicating the degree of importance that many residents and visitors to Westminster attach to cycling as an issue. It may also be linked to the prominence of cycling and cycle safety issues in London in the weeks leading up to the consultation, during which six cyclists were killed on London’s streets between Tuesday 5th November and Monday 18th November. Protests from campaign groups continued into December 2013 when the consultation launched. A timeline of key media stories relating to cycling between November 2013 and the closure of the consultation on 20 January 2014 can be found in Appendix 4.

2.0.2 The respondent profile presented below (in sections 2.1 and 2.2) is based on the 1875 people who responded to the questionnaire only. The Council does not hold this type of information for those who submitted written responses via email or letter. Out of the 61 written responses, 43 were from organisations and the remaining 18 were from individuals. Of the 43 organisations, there were responses from: 13 transport based interest groups/operators, 10 landowners/developers, 7 public bodies, 6 representing business interests, 4 other types of organisation (utilities, environment/heritage groups) and 3 residents’ groups. Summaries of the responses from organisations are provided in Appendix 5. A full copy of the response from the Westminster Cycling Campaign, as Westminster’s primary cycle lobby group, is contained in Appendix 6.

2.1 Sex, age, and reason for travelling into Westminster

2.1.1 Respondents to the consultation were most likely to be male (67%), aged 35-44 (30%), and to work in Westminster (50%). This is considered to be fairly representative of the types of cyclists that we see on Westminster’s streets, based on the previous research undertaken by TfL which is referred to in the strategy. The age categories into which respondents fall and their reasons for travelling into Westminster are illustrated in the pie charts below.

**Figure 2.1: Age of consultation respondents**

- 16-24: 6%
- 25-34: 12%
- 35-44: 26%
- 45-54: 23%
- 55-64: 30%
- 65 and over: 4%

**Figure 2.2: Reasons for travelling in Westminster**

- Work in Westminster: 50%
- Resident in Westminster: 25%
- Student in Westminster: 12%
- Travel through Westminster: 11%
- Other: 2%
2.2 Cycling trips in Westminster

2.2.1 Almost three quarters (71%) of respondents to the consultation cycle in Westminster on a regular basis (ie at least once a week). A further 15% cycle once to three times a month, whilst 13% never cycle. This is shown in Figure 2.3. The profile of those who cycle most frequently (ie daily) mirrors that of the survey respondents overall; 70% are male, 33% are aged 25-34 and 31% are aged 35-44, and 62% work in Westminster. However, the profile of the 13% of respondents who state that they never cycle in Westminster differs substantially from this pattern: those who do not cycle in the City are more likely to be female (56%), older (25% aged 55-64 and 23% aged 45-54), and residents of Westminster (61%).

2.2.2 Respondents who cycle in Westminster on a regular basis are, perhaps unsurprisingly, most likely to use their own bikes: this figure stands at 95% among those who cycle every day or at least once a week, while approximately a quarter of respondents in each of these categories also use Barclays Cycle Hire bikes on occasion (24% and 25% respectively). As the frequency with which respondents cycle declines, the likelihood of their using a Barclays Cycle Hire bike increases: among those who cycle in Westminster between two and three times a month, 34% make use of these facilities, while almost two fifths (39%) of those who cycle at least once a month do so. These figures are shown in the Table 2.1 below.
2.2.3 While almost three quarters (74%) of respondents who state that they never cycle in Westminster claim not to use any sort of bike on any occasion, the table above shows that 15% sometimes use their own bikes, and 5% make use of the Barclays Cycle Hire facilities across London. This indicates that a significant proportion of those who never cycle in Westminster may be willing to do so elsewhere, or they may own a bike that they don't use.
3. Barriers to cycling and overall priorities

3.1 Barriers to Cycling

3.1.1 Consultees were asked to list any barriers that they feel stop them from cycling more frequently. 1704 people responded to this question and their responses were grouped into common themes, which are shown in Figure 3.1 below. It should be noted that many respondents who already cycle frequently used this question as an opportunity to raise their concerns about cycling in Westminster.

**Figure 3.1: Barriers to cycling**

![Figure 3.1: Barriers to cycling](image)

3.1.2 Of those who responded, the most frequently cited barrier was regarding route design or infrastructure issues, which 35% identified as a barrier. This included issues around poor road layout, lack of cycle lanes or segregation and poor permeability due to the network of one way streets. Road safety was a concern for 26% and 20% said that traffic volume/congestion was a hindrance. In relation to these points, a common observation was that Westminster’s main roads felt too unsafe to cycle on due to the traffic volumes, the number of HGVs and general congestion. However, respondents felt that there were no viable alternatives due to the network of one way streets that don’t join up to form coherent, easy to navigate routes. Some said that there were key junctions that were seen as obstructions to their journey (such as Trafalgar Square or Parliament Square), but that the alternative routes to avoid them can involve a significant detour. These concerns will largely be addressed through the actions identified in Objectives A and B of the strategy, particularly through the actions around the delivery of a Cycle Grid and safer junctions. It should be noted that volume of traffic and congestion is harder to address directly through the strategy, other than encouraging more people to cycle.
which can help to ease congestion and also encouraging cyclists to use quieter routes such as those on the Cycle Grid rather than main roads.

3.1.3 Lack of cycle parking was a barrier for 13% of respondents, which will be addressed through the actions in Objective C of the strategy. Road user behaviour, identified as a barrier by 12% of respondents will be tackled as part of Objectives B and D. It should be noted that these comments related to a range of road users groups – pedestrians and cyclists as well as car/taxi/bus/HGV drivers. Some said they felt that a greater police presence on the road was needed. Of course, there are some barriers which are impossible for the strategy to address, such as the weather (cited by 9% of people).

3.1.4 Other barriers that are worth noting included people's personal circumstances such as work commitments or childcare arrangements. A number of respondents noted that whilst they frequently cycle in Westminster, their partner/family are uncomfortable doing so, which prevents trips together being made by bicycle. Some said that they avoid cycling in Westminster altogether, preferring to shop/meet friends in other boroughs that are more accessible. One person noted that they felt a need to ‘gear up’ (with helmet, high visibility clothing etc) in order to cycle in Westminster which prevents them from making more ad hoc trips by bike. This ‘gearing up’ is considered necessary to achieve the speed needed to cycle safely with other traffic in Westminster and protect oneself from harm. They noted that if there was segregation, they would feel more able to travel at a more leisurely pace as they would not be so worried about the need to keep up with traffic and could wear normal work clothes.

3.1.3 Figures 3.2 and 3.3 show the differences in responses to this question depending on the gender of the respondent and the frequency with which they cycle in Westminster. Whilst the top three barriers between different groups are the same overall (safety, traffic volume and lack of infrastructure), it can be seen that more women than men considered safety, traffic and the attitude of other road users as a barrier, whilst more men were likely to suggest more infrastructural based concerns such as lack of cycle lanes as a barrier.

3.1.4 In terms of frequency of cycling, the most noticeable difference between these groups is that a greater proportion of daily cyclists consider infrastructure to be a concern, whilst for those who never cycle general safety issues are more of a concern. It should be noted that for those who cycle daily, it could be argued that there are no real barriers as they are already cycling very frequently. So they are more concerns that are raised rather than complete barriers. Other barriers for those who cycle less frequently were the attitude of other road users and lack of cycle parking facilities.
3.2 Priorities
3.2.1 Consultees were asked how important each of the Council’s four core Cycling Strategy objectives are. Figure 3.4 shows that almost all respondents (98%) feel that it is important to make Westminster’s roads safer, while 91% feel that the Council should help different road users get on better together (eg through enforcement, training and campaign work). Fewer respondents feel that the Council should support residents to possess and maintain their own bikes (eg. through improved cycle parking, cycle hire, maintenance and bike security): just under two thirds (63%) of respondents feel that this should be an important consideration.

Figure 3.4: Relative importance of objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Fairly important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make Westminster safer for road users</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help different road users to get on well together</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage more people to cycle</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support residents to own and maintain their own bikes</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2 Given the above findings, it is considered that the objectives set out in the strategy are presented in the correct priority order. A significant number of respondents have said that they consider it crucial to deliver physical improvements to cycle routes first in order to encourage more people to cycle. Given the findings from the consultation, the focus of the Council’s activities and spending over the next two years will be primarily on the delivery of the Central London Cycle Grid and other physical improvements. However, this will also be supported by lower cost schemes that help to deliver the other objectives.
Part 4: Creating safer and more legible routes

4.1 Relative importance of proposed actions

4.1.1 A number of potential actions for creating safer and more legible routes were put to the public as part of the Council’s cycling consultation. Those selected by respondents as the most important included making improvements to road junctions (82%), the identification of areas where high numbers of cycling accidents take place, with a view to making these areas safer (74%) and introducing a Central London Cycle Grid (64%).

4.1.2 Options less popular with respondents were those that concerned specific routes that perhaps may be used by smaller numbers of cyclists, such as riverside and canal-side routes (selected as an important concern by 19% of respondents) and provision for cyclists entering and leaving parks (16%). In the case of the latter of these options, respondents who do not use any sort of bike within Westminster are almost twice as likely to view it as an important action for the Council to take (31%, compared to an average of 16% across all other demographic groups). This may be taken to indicate that the improvement of provision for cyclists entering and leaving parks is in fact of greater concern to pedestrians and other users of public open spaces than to cyclists themselves. The overall proportion of respondents to select each option for improving road safety in Westminster is illustrated in Figure 4.1.

Figure 4.1: Popularity of proposed measures for creating safer and more attractive cycle routes

- Making improvements to road junctions: 82%
- Identifying areas where a high number of cycling accidents take place, and working to make these areas safer: 74%
- Introducing a central London cycling grid: 64%
- Improving facilities for pedestrians and cyclists sharing riverside and canal-side routes: 19%
- Improving routes for cyclists entering or leaving parks: 16%
- Other: 28%
- None of these: 2%
- Don’t know: 1%
4.1.3 Of the above options, making improvements to road junctions was the most commonly selected across all demographic groups except those who do not cycle in Westminster. Groups most likely to feel that such improvements are among the most important that the Council could make include those who visit Westminster for reasons other than living or working in the City (91% of whom feel that road junctions should be one of the Council’s primary concerns), those who cycle at least once a week (87%) and those aged 25-34 (87%).

4.1.4 Perhaps unsurprisingly, given the number of cyclists killed and associated public concern in London in the weeks prior to the launch of the Council’s consultation, the improvement of cycling accident spots is also particularly popular among respondents. While the option was most frequently selected by respondents who cycle in Westminster on a daily basis (77%), it was also the most popular among respondents who do not cycle in the City (61%).

4.1.5 Just under two thirds (64%) of respondents felt that the flagship policy of the Council’s cycling strategy, the introduction of a central London cycling grid, would be among the most important actions that the Council could take in order to improve road safety within the City. Please see section 4.3 below for further analysis of people’s thoughts on the cycle grid proposals.

4.2 Other issues raised

4.2.1 It should also be noted that, while three of the five stated options for creating safer and more legible routes proved popular with substantial proportions of respondents, more than a quarter (28%) felt that approaches other than those listed would be most effective. Indeed, consultees were asked if they had any comments on how the Council can make Westminster’s roads safer for cyclists. 1475 people responded to this question and their responses were grouped into the common themes shown in Figure 4.2.

Figure 4.2: Other suggestions for creating safer and more attractive cycle routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved signage / wayfinding</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve cycle parking</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased permeability</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritise cyclists</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced stop lines</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved road surfaces</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slower vehicle speeds</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction improvements</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20mph speed limit</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGV restrictions</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved traffic lights...</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education / training</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More enforcement by police</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregation / cycle lanes</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2 Of those who responded, the majority (49%) felt that dedicated space for cyclists should be provided in the form of cycle lanes and many specifically mentioned segregation. However, 41% also said that greater enforcement and education/training were important. A full breakdown is provided in Figure 4.2.

4.2.3 Other issues raised included suggestions for improved road surfaces by 5% including attention to potholes and drain covers near the kerbside, which can cause cyclists to swerve into passing traffic. It was also noted that ponding of water can disguise potholes, again causing cyclists to avoid these areas. 5% of respondents mentioned that they would like to see more Advanced Stop Lines, and many said that greater enforcement of these was needed to prevent vehicles encroaching. A number of respondents said that they considered pinch points in the road a hazard to cyclists, including pedestrian crossings with build outs, which force them into passing traffic. They said that parking at junctions is an issue due to visibility concerns. The Westminster Property Association also observed that whilst improvements to cycling should be incorporated where possible into schemes, this should not prejudice future improvements to the public realm.

4.3 Westminster Cycle grid comments

4.3.1 Of the 1875 responses received to the questionnaire, 72% of respondents answered Question 11 on the proposed cycle grid (“What are your thoughts on the proposed cycle routes?”), with the remainder choosing not to answer the question. Of the written responses submitted by email/post, around 50% made comments on the cycle grid routes.

4.3.2 Unsurprisingly, there was a wide variation in the nature and detail of the responses reflecting the range of individual interests and groups/organisations that contributed. Comments can be divided into two types of response:

- **a) Generic comments** – eg indicating general support/opposition, commenting on general directness of routes, a desire for segregation or better connections to railway stations and parks.

- **b) Comments on specific locations** – eg suggesting improvements at a particular junction or commenting on the alignment of a particular part of a route.

**a) Generic high level comments**

4.3.3 Around 20% of people who responded to this question specifically indicated that they were in favour of the cycle grid alignments and many of the detailed comments simply offered suggestions for ways of improving it. Only 6% of respondents indicated that they did not support the project at all.

4.3.4 Of the additional general comments from those that responded to this question: 10% considered that the routes were too indirect and complicated to follow, 8% said that segregation would be desirable and that the grid would not work unless cyclists were separated from traffic, and 3% thought that traffic levels should be reduced. Other, but less common comments included suggestions for improved access to parks or
mainline stations, improved permeability through the use of contra-flows, 20 mph zones and improved enforcement. Unfortunately 15% had difficulty understanding the map or downloading it, and some noted this was because they were trying to complete the survey using their smartphone.

4.3.5 It should be noted that issues such as the introduction of 20mph zones and greater enforcement of traffic regulations have been raised in greater volumes in response to other questions and are therefore dealt with in other parts of this consultation report.

4.3.6 It is considered that the aspirations of seasoned commuters are likely to be different from those who are not cyclists at present and may therefore be less confident. For instance regular commuters are likely to want fast, direct routes on main roads, whereas less confident cyclists may prefer quieter routes. The main target group in developing and implementing the cycle grid is the novice or less confident cyclist, and responses to the analysis will reflect this objective.

b) **Route specific**

4.3.7 From the questionnaire responses, 206 separate points were made on specific parts of the grid. Of the 43 organisations, 20 of them made specific comments on the proposed cycle grid totaling 74 separate points.

4.3.8 Appendix 8 includes tables showing the key points raised in order of volume (Table 1), and also a route by route summary of the key points raised and the Council’s response to these (Table 2). A map illustrating these locations is attached to the report in Appendix 9.

4.3.9 It is clear from the plan that the majority of comments on the grid relate to the central segment of Westminster, bounded by Marylebone Road to the north and Constitution Hill/Birdcage Walk to the south. Perhaps this area represents the greatest challenge in developing the grid largely resulting from the competing demands on limited road space, both in terms of movement and urban realm, together with a wide range of vested interests. Conversely, it is also a key trip attractor/generator with significant opportunities for increasing the volume and proportion of cycling thereby helping to relieve the pressure on other modes of transport.

4.3.10 As can be seen from the table and map, there were a number of comments suggesting that certain sections of the main road network should be included in the grid, e.g. Bayswater Road, Edgware Road, Park Lane, Oxford Street and Vauxhall Bridge Road. As roads with a strategic or distributory function with high volumes of traffic and buses, the incorporation of these roads into the Cycle Grid are not consistent with the fundamental principle of the Mayor’s Cycle Vision which is to use quieter, less heavily trafficked streets in order to attract less confident cyclists. However, they will continue to be available for cyclists to use, particularly those cyclists that seek a direct route, and many already incorporate facilities for cyclists (e.g. bus lanes, ASLs and advisory cycle lanes). Some are part of the TLRN and comments relating to these have been passed to TfL for consideration.

4.3.11 Table 2 in Appendix 8 summarises the potential for changes to the grid in light of the comments made as summarised above. It should be stressed that many of the
suggested amendments to the grid have already been investigated during its development over the past year prior to publication and were not pursued for a variety of reasons. This work included looking at numerous alternative options for route alignments for the whole grid. Nevertheless, against this background a review has been undertaken of all the suggestions made through the consultation and recommendations are put forward for a review of a selected number of them where there appear to opportunities for improvement. A summary of the key actions can be found in section 4.5 of this report.

4.3.12 A number of the organisations stated that they would welcome continued dialogue with the Council on the emerging details of the grid. Indeed, a number have already been engaged in discussions on the grid and related matters. Liaison with adjoining boroughs has been ongoing throughout development of the grid and this will continue.

4.3.13 Looking further ahead, there will be a need to keep the network under review to respond to a range of factors including new developments, urban realm schemes, transport related schemes (e.g. Crossrail), as well as highway and utility repairs.

4.4 Findings from the TfL Cycle Grid consultation

4.4.1 TfL received 713 responses to its consultation on the proposed Cycle Grid routes. When considering this analysis it should be recognised that many of the people that responded to Westminster’s consultation will have then also responded to TfL’s Cycle Grid consultation.

4.4.2 TfL’s analysis shows that the most commonly raised general points were:

1. Support for the five points from the London Cycling Campaign* - 46%
2. Support for the idea of the grid – 13%
3. Suggestion of a grid wide 20 mph speed limit – 8%
4. Support for segregated cycle lanes – 8%
5. Support for improved east-west connectivity – 2%

* The five points from LCC can be summarised as follows:

a) The Cycle Grid must be designed in a way that makes it **suitable for all people who ride bicycles, not just slow or novice cyclists**

b) **Removing through motor traffic** (using bollards, for example) should be a core principle of the Cycle Grid, helping to ensure no one cycles on a street with motor vehicles over **20mph** or more than **2000 PCUs** (passenger car units) per day

c) Cycle routes should be **direct, with safe and convenient crossings** of minor and main roads, in particular the inner ring road and River Thames

d) There should be a **coherent network of routes, without major gaps** that force people on to streets that are unpleasant or dangerous
e) The Cycle Grid should be delivered in a reasonable time, with 12 months as a realistic timetable.

4.4.3 Westminster attracted the highest number of comments on its part of the grid network through the TfL consultation, which is to be expected given the area of coverage and position at the heart of the grid. 140 responses were received that contained references to Westminster sections of grid. The top 3 comments were considered to be:

a) The network needs to be better connected eg St James’s and Soho (47 people)

b) Improve cycle facilities at key places (eg Edgware Road and Mayfair) (29 people)

c) Make the Inner Ring Road part of the Grid (22 people)

4.5 Summary of suggested amendments to section 5A of the strategy

a) Issues that will be incorporated into the revised strategy:

- Action A1 (on the cycle grid) has been expanded to include a commitment to deliver a core network of cycle grid routes by 2016, as shown on the map within the strategy;
- Cycle Grid amendments:
  - the existing Cycle Superhighway Route 8 along Grosvenor Road has been incorporated into the grid map.
  - The preferred alignment for the Jubilee Line has now been amended to show a more direct route through Green Park.
  - The alignment for CS11 to the south of Regents Park has been modified.
  - Where the consultation plan showed two possible alignments for a single route, a preferred option has now been highlighted, based on further feasibility work that has been undertaken since the consultation.
- A reference to the draft London Cycle Design Standards (LCDS) has also been included, specifying that the Council will consider these guidelines during the development of all cycle grid routes.
- The strategy now provides some examples of the types of interventions that will be considered.
- the alternative routes project with the Canal and River Trust has now been incorporated into the Cycle Grid project
- Action A2 (relating to other improvements to safety and connectivity) has been expanded to include a review of local connections between the cycle grid and key facilities such as railway stations, schools and shopping areas;
- A reference to not prejudicing future public realm schemes when making cycling improvements has been added, given the Council’s policy to prioritise pedestrian movement;
- A new action has been added supporting the use of freight consolidation schemes as a way of reducing and managing the number of HGV/LGV traffic on Westminster’s roads.
• Action A9 has been expanded to commit the Council to developing an appropriate maintenance regime to tackle any defects on Cycle Grid routes

A range of other issues and suggested solutions were raised, such as addressing inconsiderate behaviour by different road user groups and enforcement. However, these are covered in other sections of this report.

b) Detailed issues that will be taken into account during the further development of cycle grid routes:

• encouraging TfL to consider cycle journey times in the phasing of traffic signals,
• increasing provision of Advanced Stop Lines,
• consideration of ‘cycle gutters’ alongside steps to help cyclists wheel their bikes up these,
• the continued removal of guard-railing where pedestrian safety considerations allow
• continued implementation of parking restrictions on corners to improve visibility for both pedestrians and cyclists.
• The Council will put forward additional cycle grid links for discussion with TfL (for implementation post 2016), including Grosvenor Place, Lupus Street and Claverton Street. Please note that these new routes will not be shown on the plan until they have been agreed with TfL.
• Continued discussion with Camden over Q19 and Q7 links
• Continued consideration of impact of construction traffic on routes eg Sussex Gardens, Whitcomb Street, Jermyn Street
• Continued investigation of the Drury Lane alignment for Q68, as a possible alternative to Wellington Street
• Continue to develop Whitcomb Street proposals in conjunction with the developers in the vicinity
• Forward comments received that relate to boundary areas/other authorities as appropriate

c) Points that have not been included in the revised strategy but that will be kept under review:

• Greater reprioritisation of road space towards cycling
• Provision of fully segregated cycle lanes on all cycle grid routes
• Adoption of a full modal hierarchy, building on the Council’s City Plan policy that already prioritises the pedestrian. This would place modes in the following order after pedestrians: cyclists, buses, freight, taxis, private vehicles.
• The incorporation of main arterial roads eg Edgware Road, Bayswater Road, into the cycle grid network
• The adoption of 20 mph zones/limits
• Limiting the time or area in which HGVs can operate
• Permitting cycling within Paddington Recreation Ground
Part 5: Improving interaction between different road users

5.1 Relative importance of proposed actions

5.1.1 When asked to consider potential approaches that the Council could adopt in order to encourage good relationships among road users, those seen as important by the highest proportions of respondents were those that related specifically to the conduct of larger vehicles: just under two thirds (64%) of respondents felt that establishing a working relationship with Transport for London in order to provide training programmes for lorry drivers was among the three most important actions that the Council could take, while 59% felt that this was the case with regard to providing vehicle safety and cyclist awareness training for fleet drivers as part of council contracts. 57% felt that the rules of the road should be more strictly enforced. 56% felt that campaign work encouraging safer and more responsible sharing of the roads is important.

5.1.2 Options relating specifically to the conduct of cyclists on the road proved less popular, with just under a quarter (23%) of respondents considering the provision of free cycle training to be among the most important actions that the Council could take, and approximately one in ten respondents (11%) feeling this way with regard to the targeting of this training at groups most likely to be involved in accidents while cycling. This indicates that respondents are more likely to place blame for cycling accidents with the drivers of motor vehicles, and is likely to be representative of the number of respondents to the consultation who cycle in Westminster on a reasonably frequent basis.

Figure 5.1: Relative priorities (amongst consultees) for improving interaction between different road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working with Transport for London to provide training programmes for lorry drivers</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including vehicle safety and cyclist awareness training as a condition of any council contracts that involve the use of vehicles</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing the rules of the road, and providing the means for road users to report poor conduct</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing campaigns to encourage motorists and pedestrians to look out for cyclists, and to promote safe and responsible shared use of roads</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering free cycle training to any adult who lives, works or studies in Westminster</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeting cycle training at groups involved in the highest number of accidents, such as young men</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1.3 Also, given the context in which the consultation was undertaken, it is unsurprising that increased training for drivers of heavy goods vehicles, as well as additional policing of the rules of the road, were popular among respondents. As a result of the spate of cyclist deaths in the latter part of 2013, the Metropolitan Police launched Operation Safeway, an approach intended to improve road safety by stopping road users thought to be infringing the Highway Code, and issuing fixed-penalty fines for those for whom this was found to be the case. While this approach initially drew criticism from some detractors for “scapegoating”, given the high proportion of cyclists stopped in comparison to the number of road users that they constitute, an article published in The Times on 6 January illustrated the extent of the problems found with heavy goods vehicles as the operation continued. Of the 821 lorries stopped during the first two months of the operation, approximately two thirds were found to be defective or were being driven illegally, while just 4% were fitted with all of the legally required safety equipment, including bars to prevent the crushing of cyclists beneath the wheels. Other drivers were fined for operating vehicles without fully functioning lights or with loads that were not securely attached, or for having worked for longer than the maximum legal number of consistent hours of driving. These figures indicate that, as highlighted by respondents, there is significant scope to increase the extent of adherence to the Highway Code in central London.

5.1.4 The degree of importance that respondents attach to additional training for HGV drivers may also relate to the frequency with which these vehicles are involved in fatal cycling accidents. Of the six cyclists killed in London in the weeks before the launch of the consultation, three had been involved in collisions with lorries, two had collided with buses, and one had been involved in an accident with a coach. Furthermore, of the cyclists killed in London during the course of 2013, almost two thirds (64%) had been involved in a collision with a heavy goods vehicle. The total number of cycle deaths in London from 2010-2013, as well as the proportion of these deaths that involved heavy goods vehicles, are shown in the graph below.

5.1.5 Demographic groups most likely to favour the provision of additional training programmes for lorry drivers include those who cycle in Westminster at least once a week (71%) or between two and three times each month (69%), and those who work in Westminster (68%). Respondents who are among the least likely to consider this to be an important intervention include those who never cycle in Westminster (36%), as well as those living in Westminster itself (53%) and those who cycle at least once a month (55%). A very similar pattern can be seen with regard to those respondents who selected including vehicle safety and cyclist awareness training as part of all council contracts that involve vehicles: groups most likely to have selected this option included those who cycle between two and three times a month (69%) and those who work in Westminster (68%), while groups least likely to attach particular importance to this option are those who never cycle in Westminster (30%), and those who live in Westminster or are aged 65 or over (48% in both cases).

1 www.theguardian.com/environment/bike-blog/2013/nov/28/police-ticket-quota-cyclists-deaths-london-streets
2 www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/public/cyclesafety/article3966743.ece
3 Ibid.
5.1.6 Of those respondents who never cycle, the top three responses were enforcing the rules of the road (64%), followed by offering free cycle training (38%) and providing fleet driver training (36%).

5.2 Other suggestions for improving interaction between road users

5.2.1 Consultees were asked if they had any comments on how the Council can encourage different road users to get on better together. 1005 people responded to this question and their responses were grouped into common themes. Of those who responded, education and training was commonly mentioned (31%), enforcement (21%) and segregation (20%).

Figure 5.2: Other suggestions for improving interaction between road users

5.2.2 In relation to education training, aside from support for the actions already contained within the strategy, there were suggestions that the Council should undertake a myth-busting campaign to highlight a range of issues and aim to dissipate the illusion of a ‘war on the roads’. This includes the reasons why cyclists act as they do – for instance taking a primary position in the road, why its important for motorists not to encroach into ASLs, to clarify who pays road tax and why, to highlight that many cyclists also walk or drive for some journeys. A number of respondents also suggested that there was a need to promote the benefits of cycling, and offered to feature in promotional materials.

5.2.3 Almost four fifths of respondents to the consultation (78%) have never undertaken any cycle training on the streets of London, with just 13% having received any such training within the past five years, and 10% of respondents having done so in the more distant past. Of those who have received cycle training, almost a quarter (24%) did so at school, while 16% have undertaken a training course through their employers. Of those who have received training from a different source, by far the most frequent is their local council: this is illustrated in the diagram below. Overall, almost a quarter (24%) of respondents who have undertaken cycle training in London did so through this avenue, with frequently cited councils including Westminster, Camden and Lambeth. In the survey, respondents were asked to provide their
contact details if they would like to receive free cycle training and almost 300 people provided their details, which have been passed to the Council’s cycle training provider. A company called ‘Wheels for Wellbeing’ submitted a response outlining the work that they do with disabled people, using adaptive bikes to help them learn how to cycle. The Council will establish what scope there might be to work in partnership with this organisation, although it is understood that Wheels for Wellbeing are already active within Regents Park.

A few respondents suggested that online safety tips and a summary of the Highway Code for cyclists would be useful, and this has been incorporated into the revised strategy. Kensington and Chelsea have established a programme of handing out bike lights to cyclists spotted without lights (‘Light Angels’) and low cost initiatives such as this will be explored further.

5.2.4 A number of respondents said that Safer Urban Driving Courses should be extended to a wider range of professional fleet drivers, including bus and coach, LGV and taxi drivers. This will be included in the revised strategy.

5.2.5 There was support for greater enforcement against all road users, with a wide range of examples of poor conduct provided. One person suggested that enforcement officers should be in plain clothes and on bikes for maximum effect – with both cyclists and drivers being more cautious of their behaviour. However, the Road Traffic Act only gives constables in uniform the powers to stop traffic, so it would not achieve the desired aim.

5.2.6 Many people commented that only the provision of better infrastructure would help to improve safety on Westminster’s roads, through the actions highlighted in section A of the strategy.

5.2.7 Some of the points raised fall outside of the remit of the Council. However a list of points on which to lobby central government, TfL and other bodies, will be drawn up and actioned.

5.3 Summary of suggested amendments to Section 5B of strategy:

a) Issues that will be incorporated into the revised strategy:

- Action B2 – the Council’s cycle training programme will be rebranded as City Cycling Courses, to help reflect their content, widen their appeal and recognise that cycling in central London requires more advanced skills if cycling on main roads without fully segregated cycling facilities. The importance of cyclists being aware of people who may not have seen or heard them coming, particularly blind and partially sighted people, has also been included.
- Action B4 – the Council will seek TfL support to enable driver training courses to be extended to other professional drivers such as taxi and bus/coach drivers
- Action B6 - Throughout the consultation respondents have consistently raised concerns about inconsiderate behaviour by different road user groups. It emphasises the need for greater enforcement against all road users by the police, building on the success of the recent
Operation Safeway. Although the strategy already includes an action to lobby the police for greater enforcement, it demonstrates that this type of targeted enforcement can have a significant impact on road user behaviour, which needs to be sustained. The action related to enforcement action has been updated to reflect the Met Police’s commitment to continue Operation Safeway, albeit at a less frequent intensity. This regular enforcement activity is important in reinforcing messages around sharing the road safely. It also recognises that a tool for reporting poor user road conduct already exists on the police website, and that this will be promoted through the Council website.

- Actions B7 and B8 - have been combined to recognise the importance of joined up and consistent road safety messages to different road user groups. It also reflects the positive campaign work that is already being carried out by TfL and the need for the Council to tie in with this. A reference to the particular vulnerability of pedestrians, including blind and partially sighted people, has been included. Low cost initiatives to support safer cycling will also be considered.

- There are certain actions that could improve cycle safety that fall outside of the remit of the Council. However, the Council will lobby TfL and central government on a range of issues such as the fitting of improved equipment to HGVs, trialling innovative new cycling infrastructure, integrating cycle training into the national curriculum and reviewing driving test components to include on-cycle training.

b) Points that have not been included in the revised strategy but that will be kept under review:

- Limiting the time or area in which HGVs can operate
- A scheme for disabled people who wish to learn how to cycle
- The introduction of 20 mph limits/zones
- Provision of fully segregated cycle lanes on all cycle grid routes
Part 6: Enabling bike ownership, storage and parking

6.1 Relative priorities

6.1.1 Of the four core areas discussed in the draft cycling strategy produced by the Council, respondents are least likely to consider the provision of support for people wishing to possess their own bikes to be an important issue for the Council to consider: just under two thirds of respondents (63%) stated that this was the case, compared to 87% or more for each of the other three options covered within the strategy. However, respondents are very clear in terms of how they feel that the Council could best support residents in this regard: 84% felt that the provision of a greater number of secure facilities in which to store bikes was among the most important actions that the Council could take in order to facilitate bike ownership. This is almost double the proportion of respondents who selected the promotion of bike security and marking in order to promote cycle thefts, which was the second most commonly cited option in this category: this figure stands at 43%. The proportion of residents who attach particular importance to each potential method of supporting residents to possess and maintain their own bikes is illustrated in Figure 6.1.

Figure 6.1: Popularity of proposed methods for enabling bike ownership and improving cycle parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing a greater number of secure facilities in which to park your bike</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting bike security and marking in order to help reduce cycle thefts</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering courses in bike maintenance</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging Transport for London to expand its cycle hire area</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing on-the-spot bike safety checks in the street</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refurbishing abandoned bikes for future use</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a ‘Parking Finder’ app</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting a bike loan scheme</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1.2 Support for the provision of a greater number of secure parking facilities is lower among those who live in Westminster (76%) than among those who work in Westminster (84%) or who neither reside nor are employed within the City (91%). This is, in all probability, a result of the proportion of respondents who live in Westminster who do not themselves cycle: 29% of all respondents who reside in the City state that they never cycle in Westminster, compared to 7% of those who work in Westminster.
Westminster and 5% of those who visit the City for reasons unrelated to employment or residence.

6.2 Other suggestions

6.2.1 Consultees were asked if they had any comments on how the Council can support people to own, park and maintain their bike. 630 people responded to this question and their responses were grouped into common themes. Of those who responded the most common response related to improved cycle parking (31%). This is illustrated in Figure 6.2.

**Figure 6.2: Other suggestions for enabling bike ownership and improving cycle parking**

As can be seen from the above graph, many of these comments were in relation to additional cycle parking, welcoming extra provision as set out in the proposed actions. It was suggested that more cycle parking is needed at mainline railway stations and an action to reflect this will be included in the revised strategy. There was support for advice for home owners on storage of bikes in the home, ranging from wall fittings through to the installation of facilities in basements/gardens. It was also suggested that the police should dedicate extra resource to tackling bike theft, a point which will be included in the revised strategy. A number of suggestions were made in relation to how abandoned bikes could be re-used and there is already an action within the strategy that seeks to review this. One respondent suggested that bike shops have a key role to play in marking bikes before they are sold, and it is understood that this service is already offered in many bike shops.

6.2.3 In terms of maintenance, a handful of respondents suggested that the Council trials on street bike pumps, and this is something that Council is already exploring in partnership with Victoria Business Improvement District and will therefore be included a new action. Any apps that are developed with have the locations of on street bike pumps and other local repair facilities / shops included.

6.3 Summary of suggested amendments to section 5C of the strategy

a) Issues that will be incorporated into the revised strategy:
• Action C8 – a new action to reflect that the Council will work in partnership with Network rail to identify new locations for cycle parking at or near the mainline railway stations.
• Action C9 has been amended to reflect that the Council will make its cycle parking data available to third party app developers.
• Action C11 now makes reference to encouraging the police to dedicate increased resource to tackling bike theft.
• Action C13 – now includes a new action to trial bike pumps in Westminster and to incorporate locations of repair facilities/shops into any apps.

b) Points that have not been included in the revised strategy but that will be kept under review:

• Cycle racks on the back of buses
• Requiring lifts within new developments that are large enough to accommodate bikes
• Repair stations in underused phone boxes
Part 7: Raising awareness and participation

7.1 Relative priorities

7.1.1 When asked to consider potential approaches that the Council could adopt in order to encourage cycling in the City, respondents were most likely to highlight the promotion of cycle to school schemes (58%) and incentives to encourage people to cycle more regularly (51%). These figures are shown in Figure 7.1.

7.1.2 However, it should also be noted that a substantial number of respondents consider it unwise for the Council to encourage a greater number of cyclists onto the streets of Westminster: several have stated that this should only be attempted once improvements have been made to the cycling infrastructure in Westminster and across London and several respondents also put forward the argument that it would be specious to focus attention on encouraging more individuals to cycle at the potential expense of greater focus on improving cycle safety.

7.1.3 Groups most likely to consider the promotion of cycle to school schemes to be one of the most important actions that the Council could take in order to increase the volume of cyclists in Westminster include those who neither live nor work in Westminster (63%), and those who cycle every day or at least once a week, or are students in Westminster (61% in each case). Those least likely to consider this an important strategy are respondents who never cycle in Westminster (30%). The same groups are also the least likely to consider the implementation of an incentive scheme to be an important action to take, with the proportions citing this as an important option standing at 20% and 26% respectively. This could be in the form of a mobile app which tracks people’s journeys on foot or by bicycle and provides rewards to those who walk or cycle frequently. Groups most likely to attach particular importance to the development of an incentives scheme include those using hired bikes (87%), students in Westminster (74%), those aged 16-24 (69%) and those who cycle on a daily basis (56%). While the base sizes of the first two groups are small (18 and 23 respondents respectively), these figures can still be used to give an indication of which respondents are most likely to support which initiatives.

7.1.4 The ideas of developing an online cycling resource and establishing a network of ‘Physical Activity Champions’ are most likely to be considered important by respondents who do not themselves cycle. Among this group, the development of an online cycling resource was the most frequently cited option (selected by 38% of respondents), while across all categories including cyclists, this option was selected less frequently than each of the four shown above it in figure 7.1. While the idea of establishing a network of ‘Physical Activity Champions’ was not cited frequently by any demographic group, those who do not cycle in Westminster were more likely to cite this option than the average respondent (10% and 6% respectively).
7.2 Other suggestions

7.2.1 Consultees were asked if they had any comments on how the Council can encourage more people to cycle. 781 people responded to this question and their responses were grouped into common themes. Of those who responded, the development of safer cycle routes was most frequently cited as being important amongst 38% of responses. Segregated cycle routes also featured highly, with 25% of people saying that this would encourage more people to cycle.
Many respondents were keen to emphasise that providing the infrastructure improvements outlined in section 5A of the strategy will be the most effective action that can be taken by the Council to encourage more people to cycle. Some took the opportunity to re-iterate their views on the importance of segregated cycle routes.

A range of other suggestions were put forward. Some respondents commented that the Council should promote the benefits of cycling, including tools such as bike calculators to help people work out how much money they could save, or calories they could burn by cycling rather than travelling by car/public transport. This has been incorporated into the proposed toolkit for the website.

One person suggested a ‘bike buddy’ scheme to help novice cyclists make new journeys that they hadn’t made before, to help build confidence. This is something the Council will investigate further, and it should be noted that training sessions can be organised to cover key routes that the participant intends to use on a regular basis. Similarly led rides to school were put forward as an idea, similar to ‘walking buses’ and this will be explored through the Bike It scheme that is being run in collaboration with Sustrans.

It was suggested that the Council should organise ‘Bicycle Fairs’ which offer the opportunity for local businesses and other organisations to participate. This may also act as a wider draw for cyclists. This idea has been incorporated into the events section of the strategy.

A small number of respondents also suggested that regular Westminster based mass participation cycle rides could be organised, essentially smaller scale versions of the Ride London event. It was suggested that this could take place on a Sunday once a month to start with. Whilst there are potential public health benefits if combined with other co-ordinated activities, this is likely to require road closures, so the impact on local residents and businesses would need to be carefully considered. It would also require substantial funding and resources.

Some consultees pointed out that not everyone has access to the internet or phone apps, and reinforced the importance of ensuring that the Council continues to use a wide range of communications mediums to promote any cycling initiatives.

Summary of proposed changes to section 5D of the strategy

a) Issues that will be incorporated into the revised strategy:

Figure 7.2 – Other comments/suggestions on methods for encouraging greater uptake of cycling
Reference to the idea of running ‘Bicycle Fairs’ as part of the Council's events programme has been included.

It has been acknowledged that a balanced approach is required in terms of target markets, and the Council will aim to engage with hard to reach groups as well as those who are actively considering cycling.

A section on the website that helps to promote the benefits of cycling will be included, as well as a 'myth busting' section.

Hard copies of promotional materials will be produced for those who do not have access to the internet or smart phones.

Self guided cycle rides, with maps online

b) Points that have not been included in the revised strategy but that will be kept under review:

- Bike buddy scheme for journey to school and/or work
- Local Westminster based mass participation rides, with regular Sunday street closures
- Integration of cycle hire scheme with Oyster system
Appendix 1 – Front cover of consultation leaflet and questionnaire

HAVE YOUR SAY
Westminster City Council’s Draft Cycling Strategy

This consultation seeks your views on our draft cycling strategy for Westminster, which covers the period from 2013 to 2026.

The objectives of the public consultation are to help the council understand local and stakeholder opinion about the proposals. This will enable us to develop our final cycling strategy and to make well informed decisions on cycling initiatives.

An overview of our strategy and proposals are provided in this consultation document. You can see the full strategy at westminster.gov.uk/cyclingstrategy or request a printed copy by calling 020 7641 5628 or emailing cycling@westminster.gov.uk

Hard copies are available in libraries.

Details on how to respond can be found on page 8. The consultation runs from Tuesday 3rd December 2013 to Monday 20th January 2014.
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Westminster City Hall
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London SW1E 6QP
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Appendix 2 - List of organisations consulted

**Accessibility Groups**
Age UK London
Inclusion London
Independent Disability Advisory Group
RNIB
Royal London Society for Blind People
Transport for All

**Amenity Society & Housing Association**

**Recognised Amenity Society**
Bayswater Residents Association
Belgravia Residents Association
Covent Garden Community Association
Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association
Harrowby and District Residents Association
Hyde Park Estate Association
The Knightsbridge Association
Marylebone Association
North Paddington Society
Paddington Waterways & Maida Vale Society
Paddington Residents Active Concern on Transport (PRACT)
Pimlico FREDA
Queen's Park Estate Society
Residents' Society of Mayfair and St James's
St John's Wood Society
South East Bayswater Residents Association (SEBRA)
Thorney Island Society
Westbourne Neighbourhood Association
Westminster Society
**Other Amenity Society**

Ancient Monuments Society  
Churchill Gardens Estate  
Fitzrovia Trust  
Kensington and Chelsea with Westminster Friends of the Earth  
Kensington Society  
London Chinatown Chinese Association  
St Marylebone Society  
Soho Society  
St James's Conservation Area Trust  
The Belgravia Society  
The Chelsea Society  
The Garden History Society  
The Georgian Group  
The Strand, Aldwych and Trafalgar Square Association  
The Twentieth Century Society  
The Victorian Society  
Westminster Amenity Societies Forum (WASF)

**Housing Association**

CityWest Homes Limited  
Network Stadium Housing Association  
Octavia Housing  
Sanctuary Housing Association - Dean Abbot House

**Business/Landowners/Architects/BIDS/Planning/Consultants/Property/Solicitors**

**Architects**

Bennetts Associates  
Iceni Projects Limited  
M R Partnership
Oslo Architecture
Sanei Hopkins Architects
Trehearne Architects
Wells Mackereth Architects

**Business**
BRE Global Limited
CBI London
Federation of Small Business
South London Business Forum
South London Partnerships
TCG Bars Limited
Thornbury Castle
UPS
Westminster Property Association (WPA)

**BIDs**
Baker Street BID
Bayswater Village
Heart of London Business Alliance
New West End Company (NWEC)
Paddington BID
Victoria Business Improvement District (BID)

**Business Entertainment**
Royal Albert Hall

**Business Property**
BNP Paribas Real Estate
Development Securities PLC
Drew Planning & Development Ltd
European Land & Property Ltd
Foreextra Developments Ltd
GMS Estates Limited
Grosvenor LTD
Langham Estate Management Limited
Legal and General Property
Pocket Living
Qatari Diar
Soho Estates Ltd
St James Group Ltd

**Consultancy/Architects**
HTA Design LLP
Carter Jonas
ARUP
Colliers International
eas planning a trading name of Capita Symonds
Mono Consultants Ltd
pcdalton consultancy
Richard Coleman City Designer

**Landowner**
Great Portland Estates Plc
Grosvenor
Howard de Walden Estates Ltd
Land Securities Group PLC
Shaftesbury PLC
The Crown Estate
The Portman Estate

**Planning Consultants**
Alan Wipperman and Co
Carter Jonas
CBRE Ltd
Cluttons LLP
Colliers Ltd
Collins & Coward Limited
Deloitte Real Estate
Derek Horne & Associates Ltd
DHA Planning
DP9
DS2
DPDS
ESA Planning
First Plan
Fusion Online Ltd
Gerald Eve LLP
GL Hearn
GVA Grimley Ltd
Iceni Projects Limited
Knight Frank LLP
Malcolm Scott Consultants Ltd
McCarthy & Stone
Metropolis
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
Natural England
NLP Planning
Paul Dickinson & Associates
Paul Kentish & Co
PC Dalton Planning
Planning Potential Ltd
Planware Ltd
Preston Bennett
Quadrant Town Planning Ltd
Quod
Rinsler
Rolle Judd Planning
Savills(UK) Limited
Scott Brownrigg
Strutt and Parker
TJR Planning
tp bennett LLP
Turley Associates
Turnberry Consulting

**Property Consultants**
Bective
DTZ
HDG Ltd
Kirkwells
Shire Consulting

**Property Developers**
Derwent London
Loftus Family Property
Londonewcastle

**Solicitors**
PDT Solicitors
Royds

**Charitable/Voluntary Organisation/Faith/Community**

**Charity**
Action on Hearing Loss
Arthritis Care
Bengali Cultural Association
Bengali Women's Group
Caxton Youth Organisation
Cosmic (Children of St. Mary's Intensive Care)
Covent Garden Area Trust
Dolphin Square Foundation
Foundation for People with Learning Disabilities (FPLD)
Mental Health Foundation
Groundwork Trust (Camden, Islington & Westminster)
Guide Dogs for the Blind
Inner London Scope Nor-West Club
LHA London Ltd
London Diocesan Fund
Mind - National Association for Mental Health
One Housing Group
Out and About Club
Parkinson's UK
Pursuing Independent Paths - PIP
Salvation Army - Edward Alsop Court
Spinal Injuries Association (SIA)
St. Andrews Club
St. Vincent's Family Project
The Theatres Trust
The Tree Council
Western Charitable Foundation
Friends of the Earth

Community
Leicester Square Association
Maryland Road Community Association
Soho Family Centre
Westminster Senior Citizens Forum

Faith Organisation
British Buddhist Association
The Central London Gurdwara
The Church Commissioners
The Roman Catholic Diocese Of Westminster

Health
HCA International Ltd
Public Health Intelligence and Social Determinants
St. Mary's Hospital Estates & Facilities

Public Bodies

Government Department
English Heritage
Environment Agency (London Office)
London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA)
Natural England
The Royal Parks Agency
Transport for London (TfL)
Homes and Communities Agency

London Borough
Brent Planning Service
City of London
Cross River Partnership (Lambeth Office)
Department for Transport
Greater London Authority
London Borough of Brent
London Borough of Camden
London Borough of Islington
London Borough of Lambeth
London Borough of Southwark
London Borough of Wandsworth
London Councils
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea

Police/Fire/Ambulance
City of London Police
London Ambulance
Metropolitan Police (Central Traffic Unit)

Public Service
Liverpool University
PCCG Licensing Working Party
Pimlico Toy Library

Education/Schools
Westminster Schools

Other Education
London Business School
Paddington Academy
University of Westminster
Westminster Academy

Transport Operators/ interest groups
AA
All party cycling group
Association of Bikeability Schemes
Big bus tours
Brake
British Cycling
Campaign for Better Transport
Canal and River Trust
Central London Forward
Central London Freight Quality Partnership
Confederation of Passenger Transport
CrossRail
Cycling Embassy of Great Britain
DHL
East South East London Thames Gateway Transport Partnership
Freight Transport Association
Go Ahead London
The Inland Waterways Association
Institute of Advanced Motorists
Licensed Taxi Drivers Association
Licensed Private Hire Car Association

Living Streets
London duck tours
London Cycling Campaign
London Tourist Coach Operators Association (LTCOA)

London Travelwatch
Motorcycle Action Group (MAG)
NSL
Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety (PACTS)
Premium tours
RAC Foundation
Road Haulage Association
Road Peace
Sustrans
The original tour
The ghost bus tours
Town Planning Network Rail
Trade Team
Westminster Living Streets
Wheels for Wellbeing
**Westminster Internal**

All Councillors
City Planning Delivery Unit
Corporate Property Division
Development Planning Delivery Unit
Libraries and Culture
All Strategic Directors
Transportation Commissioning
WCC Environmental Sciences Team

**Other Associations**

Abbey Community Association Ltd/South Westminster Action Network
Jacs Club
Rank
St. Judes Over 50s Club
The British Hospitality Association
Westminster Senior Citizens Forum
Appendix 3 – Summary of coverage on the internet

Resident’s Groups and Members

  Provides links to the consultation pages and shows the email by Cllr Ed Argar

  Provides detailed comments on the strategy

- Jonathan Glanz West End Ward Councillor - [http://j-glanz.blogspot.co.uk/2013/12/share-your-views-on-cycling-in.html](http://j-glanz.blogspot.co.uk/2013/12/share-your-views-on-cycling-in.html)
  Provides links to the consultation and gives some background

Transport organisations / user groups

- Brent Cyclists - [http://www.brentcyclists.org.uk/content/westminsters-draft-cycling-strategy](http://www.brentcyclists.org.uk/content/westminsters-draft-cycling-strategy)
  Highlights the response given by David Evans

- Cab trade news - [http://cabtradenumer.wordpress.com/2013/12/09/westminster-cycling-strategy/](http://cabtradenumer.wordpress.com/2013/12/09/westminster-cycling-strategy/)
  Provides links to the consultation pages and sets the context

  Provides detailed comments on the strategy

  Provides information on our consultation as well as the Central London Grid consultation

- Cycle London City - [http://www.cyclelondoncity.blogspot.co.uk/2013/12/westminster-council-publishes-cycle.html?m=1](http://www.cyclelondoncity.blogspot.co.uk/2013/12/westminster-council-publishes-cycle.html?m=1)

- London Cycling Campaign - [http://lcc.org.uk/discussions/westminster-revises-draft-cycling-strategy](http://lcc.org.uk/discussions/westminster-revises-draft-cycling-strategy)
  Highlights details of the consultation and provides comments

  Provides links to the consultation.


- Southwark Cyclists - [http://southwarkcyclists.org.uk/westminster-cycling-strategy/](http://southwarkcyclists.org.uk/westminster-cycling-strategy/)
Asking cyclists to respond to the strategy and providing details of the information on our website.

  Provides comments as part of the consultation

- Vole O’ speed - http://www.voleospeed.co.uk/2013/12/a-response-to-westminsters-cycling.html
  Highlights details of the consultation and provides comments

- Westminster Cycling Campaign - http://www.westminstercyclists.org.uk/
  Provides links to our strategy and the Central London Cycle Grid. Shows the comments made on both.

Other organisations

- Clean Air London - http://cleanairinlondon.org/ai1ec_event/westminster-city-council-cycling-strategy/?instance_id=182
  Provides links to the consultation pages

- Westminster University - http://site.westminster.ac.uk/psc/2013/12/westminster-cycling-strategy/
  Provides link to the consultation
### Appendix 4 – Media stories published between November 2013 and the closure of the consultation on 20 January 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Story/Incident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 5 November</td>
<td>Cyclist (male, 62) killed in Mile End after colliding with lorry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 8 November</td>
<td>Cyclist (female, 69) killed in Holborn after colliding with coach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 12 November</td>
<td>Cyclist (male, 43) killed in East Croydon after colliding with bus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 13 November</td>
<td><strong>Two cyclists killed:</strong> 24 year old woman died after colliding with lorry in Bow, and 21 year old man died after colliding with double decker bus in Aldgate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 14 November</td>
<td>Boris Johnson gives radio interview and states that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- While there could be “no question of blame or finger-pointing”, cyclists needed to obey the rules of the road. If road users did not do so, there would be “no amount of traffic engineering that we invest in that is going to save people’s lives.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- “You cannot blame the victim in these circumstances. But what you can say is that when people make decisions on the road that are very risky – jumping red lights, moving across fast-moving traffic in a way that is completely unexpected and without looking to see what traffic is doing – it’s very difficult for the traffic engineers to second-guess that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These comments were taken by some politicians and cycling groups to mean that Johnson felt that cyclists, rather than HGVs and other large vehicles, were primarily at fault for the deaths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 18 November</td>
<td>Morning: Police stop cyclists at busy junctions and advise them to wear helmets or high-visibility clothing if not already doing so, as well as issuing £50 fixed-penalty fines to those deemed to be breaking the rules of the road. While a small number of HGVs are also stopped, with some vehicles found to be in a dangerous condition and some drivers found to have been working for too long, the much greater number of cyclists stopped has been taken by some groups as “scapegoating”. Critics also argued that such an approach detracts from the wider issue of the impact of infrastructural issues on cyclist safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evening: Cyclist (male, early 60s) killed in Camberwell after colliding with lorry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 19 November</td>
<td>Boris Johnson states that he is considering a ban on wearing headphones while cycling, and that to cycle while listening to music is “absolutely nuts.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 21 November</td>
<td>Former Olympic cyclist Chris Boardman, now a policy adviser for British Cycling, calls for Boris Johnson to consider banning HGVs from certain areas of London during peak times. Of the 14 cyclist deaths to date in 2013, nine had involved a heavy goods vehicle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 29 November</td>
<td>Frustrated that Boris Johnson and various sections of the print media appeared to be implying that cyclists themselves were likely to be at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 2 December</td>
<td>Crown Prosecution Service drops case against cyclist who stopped in front of a red light when the box reserved for cyclists was occupied by a car. ComRes poll published, according to which 68% of Londoners feel that the capital's roads are not safe to cycle on. Of those respondents who were themselves cyclists (approximately a quarter of the overall sample), 20% had stopped cycling to work and 20% had previously been involved in an accident while cycling in London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 4 December</td>
<td><strong>Cycling consultation launches</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 19 December</td>
<td>Approximately 60 cyclists stage a “die-in” on Vauxhall Bridge, where a number of cyclists and pedestrians have been killed or seriously injured in the past few years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 2 January</td>
<td>Investigation by the Evening Standard reveals that, while 40 cyclists were killed in London between 2010 and 2012, only four motorists received prison sentences. Seven received minor or suspended sentences, while 24 cases never reached court. A comment piece in the Standard argues that a tougher message needs to be sent to drivers who kill cyclists and pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 6 January</td>
<td>The Evening Standard reports on the continuing progress of Operation Safeway, as part of which police have been stopping cyclists and motorists deemed to be breaking the rules of the road. Since the operation began on 25 November, over 4000 cyclists had been issued with fixed-penalty notices for offences such as contravening traffic signals, cycling without lights at night and cycling on footpaths, while notices had been issued to almost 10,000 motorists for offences such as contravening traffic signals, using a mobile phone while driving, failing to wear a seatbelt, driving without due care and attention, driving in cycle lanes, driving without insurance and faults with their vehicle. The number of fixed-penalty notices had, according to a senior police spokesman, decreased as the operation had progressed. The Times reports that two thirds of lorries stopped as part of Operation Safeway are either defective or being driven illegally. In the first two months of the operation, 622 of the 821 lorries stopped failed to comply with existing safety rules, while just 32 had the correct safety equipment as required by law (including bars to prevent cyclists from being crushed beneath the wheels). Other drivers were fined for not having a licence, driving with insecure loads and driving with broken lights. Just 24% of HGVs complied with regulations covering vehicle maintenance, insurance and driver working hours. A total of 14 lorries were seized, including an 18-tonne scaffolding lorry with various mechanical defects and whose driver was uninsured and did not have a licence. This data intensified the debate regarding whether or not HGVs should be permitted in central London during peak times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 17 January</td>
<td>Transport Minister Robert Goodwill urges police not to fine cyclists for riding on pavements at dangerous junctions. This interjection followed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
concerns and complaints for cycling groups over the proportion of fines handed out to cyclists as part of Operation Safeway: a third of fixed-penalty notices had been issued to cyclists, despite the fact that they constitute a small minority of road users. Goodwill’s comments elicited a positive response in several comment pieces.

Monday 20 January

London Councils announces the launch of a consultation on plans to require lorries in central London to use additional mirrors and side guards in an attempt to reduce the number of accidents involving HGVs and cyclists.

Afternoon: Cyclist is knocked down in hit-and-run incident in Dalston. However, his injuries were not thought to be life-threatening.

Midnight: Cycling consultation closes.
Appendix 5 – Summary of written responses

A. TRANSPORT OPERATORS AND INTEREST GROUPS

35) Anderson Travel (Coach Operator)

Is delighted to see enhancements to highways to make cycling safer for all. Very supportive of any initiatives that increase cyclists’ proficiency, however it notes that any initiative that reduces road surface makes its task more challenging and will result in congestion and increase the risks for other road users.

Victoria Embankment – clarification sought over: arrangements for coach passenger pick up/drop off, vehicle/cycle priority at side roads, impact on traffic signal cycle times and delays, whether extra pedestrian crossings will be required over the cycle lanes and concerns for pedestrian safety, and questions over who is permitted to use what road space (for instance whether motorcycles will be permitted in cycle lanes and cyclists permitted in general traffic lanes) and the enforcement implications of this. It was also questioned whether segregated cycle lanes had been considered in the middle of the carriageway.

45) Brewery Logistics Group (BLG)

The BLG considers that the need for daily deliveries and home deliveries will grow in line with increases in population, yet the kerb space will decrease as cycle trips increase. It urges Westminster to consider how the observed peaks in cycling activity fit with freight movements, and it opposes the morning peak restrictions in freight suggested by TfL. It suggests that Westminster must work with the freight industry (FTA, CLFQP, BLG etc) to ensure an even balance of requirements is achieved.

The BLG asks the Council to consider the impacts on freight and ability to deliver before the implementation of any scheme, including cycle routes, cycle parking and cycle hire. Segregated cycle lanes are not considered appropriate as they prohibit deliveries and are not mandatory for cyclists to use. It is considered that Cycle Superhighways are currently not fit for purpose. However, if more segregation is used then deliveries into Westminster will become increasingly difficult and in some cases impossible. Considers that ‘Quietways’ may offer a better solution, but again the impact on freight needs to be considered. Considers that contraflows are not a good solution, given the issues encountered on Long Acre.

It supports actions around driver training, and enforcement against all road users. The cycle grid should include full consultation with the freight industry. Action B9 should also encourage cyclists to wear helmets and high visibility clothing.

36) Canal and River Trust (CRT)

The CRT supports the proposals within the draft strategy, including the boroughs acknowledgement of decreasing car ownership/use, the potential for change and the proposed 7% modal share target. There is support for routes being as direct, legible, coherent, attractive and comfortable to use as possible – which is vital if routes are to be an attractive alternative to the canal – an objective that is supported. The action around junction improvements, accident review and improved access to the Royal Parks is welcomed.
The CRT hopes that Westminster will consider the introduction of a 20mph limit to encourage less confident cyclists. It welcomes the actions around education and enforcement, and looks forward to working with the Council on measures to ensure that the most vulnerable towpath users are protected. It would welcome the opportunity to brief our cycle training provider on cycling on canals, the Share the Space campaign and the Greenway Code for Towpaths.

In relation to the Cycle Grid, the Grand Union, Wiggins Way and Harewood Avenue to Tresham Crescent quietways are supported, particularly the proposals for Blomfield Road and Delamere Terrace which are currently seen as key barriers to cycling permeability in the area. The CRT looks forward to working with Westminster and TfL to bring forward improvements to the towpaths and highway connections to them. It would like to see local connections into the grid, particularly via Great Western Road, Elgin Avenue, Harrow Road and Sutherland Avenue (via Warwick Avenue). It would like to see Warrington Crescent made two way for cycling.

25) Confederation of Passenger Transport (CPT)

Noted that buses and coaches are sustainable forms of transport that have the ability to move large numbers of people without taking up much roadspace, thereby minimising congestion.

A: Creating safer and more legible routes - The CPT notes that improvements will be made where this 'does not impact on other kerbside activity such as loading/unloading or access to public transport'. Coaches should be acknowledged as a form of public transport, and that due consideration is given to these movements. The CPT identifies a potential safety issues if segregated cycle lanes are to be placed in the vicinity of coach pick up/drop off points. The coach industry would like to be involved in TfL’s Better Junction Review process, given the possible impact on the coach industry at some of the proposed locations.

B: Improving road user interaction, education and enforcement – The CPT is pleased to note Westminster’s plans for training and education around large vehicles and anticipates that buses/coaches will be included in the last point.

C: Facilitating bike ownership, access and parking – The CPT would like the Council to consider the reallocation of underused residents parking bays to coach pick up/set down facilities, given that they are a sustainable form of transport. If increased cycle parking or cycle hire is implemented in the vicinity of schools or tourist areas this should not impact on coach pick up/set down facilities.

D: Raising awareness and participation in cycling – in the Cycling Toolkit, consideration should be given to providing cycle safety information in relation to large vehicles such as buses and coaches. Many companies already provide training for their drivers so this should be reciprocal.

2) Cycling Embassy of Great Britain

Feels that the complexity of managing competing demands on the Boroughs roads is being used as an excuse to do very little to make cycling in Westminster a safe and attractive prospect. More spare efficient modes of transport should be prioritised.
Considers that designing properly for cycling would reduce congestion in Westminster, as well as making it safer, less noisy and less polluted, given the number of potentially transferrable trips from the private car.

Seeks reallocation of road space on major roads, away from the private car. Considers that most of Westminster’s major roads are not narrow with often four or five lanes, which provides scope for reallocation of space towards cycling. Narrow streets could be made safe and attractive for walking and cycling by removing through traffic and ensuring that these streets are access only for motor traffic. Considers that the Council needs to reconsider its priorities.

Does not consider that an increase in cycling can be achieved through ‘integration’ of cycling with other traffic, given research on barriers to cycling identifying fear of motor traffic being one of the largest barriers.

Considers that it is essential that motor traffic speed is reduced, even on roads where cyclists are physically segregated from other traffic. Unconvinced by Council’s reasons for rejecting 20mph limits. Feels that average speeds are irrelevant, it is maximum speeds that need to be reduced. If speeds are already low then a 20mph speed limit will make no difference to journey times.

24) Ebdons Tours (coach operator)

Considers that the Health and Safety aspect of the cycling strategy in relation to other road users should be acknowledged, particularly buses, coaches and other large vehicles. Cyclists should be trained to have a much greater awareness of these vehicles, and banned from wearing headphones or using a mobile phone whilst cycling. High visibility clothing and the use of cycle lights should be made compulsory.

The company is concerned about loss of current facilities available for coaches eg. Parking bays, setting down and pick up points all of which are at a premium. The loss of these facilities would result in coaches driving around seeking such spaces, increasing congestion, worsening air quality and increasing risk to cyclists. Embankment (between Pimlico and Temple), Park Lane northbound, Baker Street and the area around Victoria station are mentioned as particular concerns where facilities should be maintained.

50) Inland Waterways Association

It considers that navigation authorities should do all they can to ensure that cyclists follow good practice and moderate their speed. It also notes that wearing headphones can reduce the person’s ability to be aware of other users or activities on the towpath.

20) LCC - Brent Cyclists

Welcomes the draft strategy. However, considers that it does not go far enough and the following changes are suggested:

a) A wider range of targets – Supports the 7% target. However, suggests that other indicators are also used such as the modal split at set locations (ie % car, bus, taxi, cycle etc).
b) Incorporation of ideas from the Netherlands and Denmark – considers that London’s streets are no narrower than those on the continent where segregation is used to encourage more people to cycle. Such ideas should be incorporated into Westminster’s strategy. Recognises that this will require political will.

c) A reduction in traffic lanes on links and at junctions, on street parking and more one way streets, freeing up space for segregation.

d) Slower speeds – a 20 mph limit should be considered

e) Westminster must stop prioritising through motor traffic and unnecessary car trips over and above the needs of cyclists. This has resulted in too many parts of its public realm becoming unpleasant and safe.

f) CIL and the associated Infrastructure Investment Framework Plan provide a new funding stream for cycling infrastructure, which could be used to supplement current funding.

g) A stronger emphasis on improving driver behaviour is needed.

38) LCC - Westminster Cycling Campaign

See Appendix 6 for full response.

44) Licensed Taxi Drivers Association (LTDA)

The LTDA generally supports the strategy. However, it had a number of suggestions. The Council should ensure that road surfaces are kept in good order as riders swerving to avoid potholes can result in accidents. More secure on street and off street parking (in under-used car parks) should be provided, and cyclists should be prepared to pay per use. It notes that it will be difficult for the Council to provide additional cycle lanes due to the heavy demand for kerbside space in Westminster. It has concerns regarding the potential for segregated/semi segregated cycle lanes due to the need for taxis to pick up / set down passengers, particularly when carrying disabled passengers when there may be a need to put down ramps to load a wheelchair.

It considers that enforcement should be increased to reduce red light jumping - a recent survey carried out on behalf of the LTDA found that more than 50% of riders ignored red lights. Compulsory training for cyclists should be introduced, with proficiency testing for all secondary school children. The LTDA has concerns that encouraging more children to cycle in Central London will increase accident rates, regardless of facilities or training. On street safety checks should be carried out by the police to ensure adequate lights and brakes. Helmets, bells and third party insurance should be compulsory. Cyclists should not be permitted to wear headphones and there should be a way of identifying cyclists. Considers that permitting cyclists to ride contraflow is dangerous.

19) Network Rail (NR)

There is a need for the strategy to highlight the importance of cycle parking and cycle route access at railway stations. Lack of cycle parking at stations is frequently raised by stakeholders as an issue, which Network rail is seeking to address. Would like to understand how Superhighways and Quietways will be connected to the stations and would welcome further discussion on this point.
Railway stations have inherent risks associated with them for cyclists as they are also often key bus stops and see heavy taxi use. The strategy should acknowledge the need for the Council, NR and TfL to work closely to provide appropriate cycle facilities at or close to railway stations, and recognise the benefits that this can deliver in terms of relief on other modes.

The strategy also needs to highlight need for more cycle parking at stations. Whilst space inside stations is limited, there may be opportunities on nearby land owned by others to provide this.

11) Sustrans

Sustrans strongly supports Westminster’s ambition to become a ‘national leader in cycling’ and broadly supports the measures and actions outlined. However, it is concerned that strategy does not grasp what modal shift to cycling can offer or demonstrate that it will give cycling sufficient priority. The strategy needs to: commit to quality and permeability of its network in line with the LCDS; demonstrate the will to re-allocate road and parking space where necessary; prioritise cyclist safety (and other vulnerable road users) over traffic capacity, road user speed and kerbside vehicle access; and define the role of its Cycling Champion in overseeing the implementation of the strategy.

It considers that potential for modal shift in Westminster is high, but this is contingent on the provision of a safe and high quality network of routes, which is hindered by the challenges set out in the strategy. Most comments are focused on section A of the strategy (in relation to routes) as infrastructure is considered to be the deliverable that will make the greatest difference. The commitments in the implementation plan are strongly supported. Recommends early stakeholder engagement during scheme development.

Objective A: Creating safer and more legible routes. ‘Direct and desirable’ should be added to this objective heading. Action A1 (Cycle Grid): Sustrans recommends the omission of the clause ‘within the specific constraints of the Westminster environment’ and inclusion of ‘in accordance with the revised LCDS’. Temporary measures should be used to pilot changes and monitor impact on other road users if necessary. Actions A2 (permeability/safety improvements)/A5 (Better Junctions Review): Strongly supported by Sustrans. Action A6/7: Sustrans recommends the use of a ‘cycle audit’ process to assess proposed transport and public realm schemes. Measures should not impede cycle access or journey times or be detrimental to space given to pedestrians. Action A8 (20mph limits): Sustrans recognises the low average speeds in Westminster but considers that this disguises incidences of faster moving traffic on particular roads. It recommends that Westminster considers the introduction of 20mph zones in areas of concern for local people and other road users or roles out a 20mph default speed limit on all borough roads. Consideration should also be given to enabling considerate cycling in green spaces within Westminster’s control, to facilitate permeability and enable children to practice cycling.

Specific cycle Grid comments: Jubilee Line – need a more direct route along St James’ St / Albermarle St / New Bond St. Central Line – need a more direct route along either Upper Brook Street or Upper Grosvenor Street. Omissions – Lupus Street to connect CSH8 to CSH5/Victoria Line (already a NCN route). More direct connections are needed between Trafalgar Square/Charing Cross and: the E-W CSH and the Strand.
**Objective B**: Improving road user interaction, education and enforcement. Sustrans particularly supports Actions B1, B2, B4, B5 and B6. It is not sure what B9 will achieve and considers that the CRT campaign covers these issues.

**Objective C**: Facilitating bike ownership/access and parking. Sustrans strongly supports these actions.

**Objective D**: Raising awareness and participation in cycling. Sustrans broadly supports the actions in this section, particularly D8 (business engagement) given Westminster’s position. However, considers that ‘near market’ are likely to take up cycling regardless of the efforts of public bodies. Targeting families connected to cycling programmes such as Sustrans ‘Bike It You Can Too’ or through schools could prove more worthwhile in reaching segments such as ‘Young Couples and Families’ and ‘Hard pressed families’.

28) Westminster Living Streets

Welcomes the changes to the strategy since the previous version was published, including urging TfL to expand the cycle hire scheme, given the omitted area includes a population who suffer from lack of activity compared to other areas of London. The strategy should cite the wider public health benefits of this proposal such as a reduction of social disconnection, with a potential for new tourist and resident visits to the historic and architecturally attractive Queen’s Park neighbourhood as well as healthy and safe travel to central London by residents.

It is disappointed that the strategy continues to treat all road users on an equal footing and tries to ensure that motor traffic is not affected by any changes. Until cyclists are given greater priority, it is considered that any policies adopted will have a marginal impact on the development of cycling. It objects to the strategy’s rejection of 20 mph zones, which has wider ramifications than just cycling. It is suggested that references to the evidence base used should be included in the strategy.

B. RESIDENT’S ASSOCIATIONS

10) Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association

Considers that the Council is not doing enough relative to other inner London boroughs in encouraging cycling and making it safer. It urges the Council to introduce a borough wide 20mph speed limit, provide improved cycling infrastructure including segregation on main roads, cycling contra-flows on one way streets, and more car free housing in new developments. It would like to see more space given to cyclists in order to keep pavements and free from cyclists (and cars). Road junctions should be free of parked vehicles to improve visibility for cyclists and pedestrians.

The comments of the Fitzrovia West Neighbourhood Forum are also endorsed.

23) Fitzrovia West Neighbourhood Forum

Considers the increase in cycling to be a positive thing for the same reasons as those set out in the strategy. It agrees that greater emphasis must be placed on making cyclists feel safer on London’s roads. It does not want just three streets in Fitzrovia West to be safe for
cyclists – it would like them all to be safe for pedestrians and cyclists, particularly children cycling to school. It would also like to see the following:

a) 20mph limit on all roads in Fitzrovia West and in other central areas, which would prevent racing between traffic lights
b) Public realm improvements and attractive landscaping whenever development is taking place – safety measures can easily be incorporated
c) Tweaking at difficult/dangerous junctions – simple interventions can make a difference
d) Segregation where necessary, achieved with planters or bollards

In terms of comments on specific routes, the New Cavendish Street alignment is preferred over the route via Duchess Street as it is more direct. It would like to see reference made to the LCDS. A reference was made to the Northchurch Street to de Beauvoir Square cycle route which it is considered could be replicated elsewhere.

41) Knightsbridge Association (KA)

It applauds the Council for its proposed cycle grid which protects cyclists from the worst air pollution and other risks on red routes. This should be considered a ‘primary’ cycle network, with a ‘secondary’ network developed within 1-2 years, equal in scale and ambition. The KA urges the Council to adopt a 20mph speed limit across the borough by early 2015. Two way cycling on one way streets should also be permitted. It refers to the Great College Street scheme in Camden in terms of a style and cost of scheme that should be replicated. It urges the Council to ask the Royal Parks to develop a cycle network through its parks, which backed by enforcement to protect pedestrians, are the safest and best places for cyclists. A large campaign to promote the grid and build public understanding of the dangers of poor air quality is needed. Ambitious targets for cycling journeys should be set for each year up to 2020.

4. BIDS / BUSINESS INTERESTS / LOCAL BUSINESSES

21) Baker Street Quarter (BSQ)

Overall very supportive of the draft Cycling Strategy, which is considered to be well balanced.

A: Creating safer and more legible routes – Whilst efforts to enhance facilities for cyclists are supported, this must not be at the expense of pedestrians and a walking strategy is needed. The needs of those living and operating in Westminster must also be recognised (in terms of competing demands on the kerbside) when considering improved routes for cyclists. BSQ supports the removal of gyratory systems to reduce traffic dominance. Considers that segregated cycle lanes should not be allowed to prejudice schemes of this sort to be implemented at a later date. The concept of a cycle grid and the routes for the BSQ area are broadly supported, particularly the exclusion of Baker Street and Gloucester Place. However, it would not support the northern side of Portman Square being returned to two way traffic should that route be chosen for the cycle route. BSQ also has concerns regarding cycle safety at Manchester Square given the current speed of traffic using it. Questions the naming of the routes after bus routes and feel this is likely to result in confusion for many cyclists. Signage needs to be carefully considered so that it does not add to clutter and is
integrated with existing signage (eg Legible London). Proper maintenance of signage is also important.

B: Improving Road User Interaction, Education and Enforcement – Supports the actions around training and contracts and is keen to help promote this to members and staff. Also supportive of increased enforcement, but not biased towards a particular user group.

C: Facilitating bike ownership/access and parking – BSQ can help to promote workplace cycle parking to its members. It would be interested in establishing a secure facility in its area. Additional on street cycle parking is welcomed but it must be sited carefully to avoid constricting already busy pavements and it also requires maintenance so it does not detract from the street environment and swift removal of abandoned bikes. BSQ urges the Council to consider the skills and training of community enterprises such as Circle Sports in Church Street with regard to the refurbishment of abandoned bikes. It considers that the Strategy should address lack of cycle parking and cycle hire at stations in conjunction with TfL to assist cyclists with the final leg of their journey. It supports the development of a cycle parking app. BSQ can assist in running events on cycle security and safety checks and promoting these to its members.

D: Raising awareness and participation in cycling – BSQ supports the actions in this section and could be a partner in helping to promote these to its members.

34) Fortnum and Mason

Whilst it is supportive of the strategy, it would like to register its strong concerns in relation to the use of Jermyn Street as a cycle route. Its store depends entirely on Jermyn Street for receiving its deliveries, where its small goods in facility is located. It tries to restrict the number of deliveries by consolidating these at its distribution centre in Cambridgeshire. However because of the scale of the business this does entail deliveries throughout the day as well as pickups for deliveries, drop offs by contractors, customer collects etc. It is considered that this activity makes it unsuitable for a cycle route. It suggests avoiding the St James’s area altogether due to the narrow, busy streets with indirect north-south and east-west routes. However if this is not possible, it suggests the use of Pall Mall / St James’s Street would be preferable.

58) Heart of London Business Alliance (HOLBA)

HOLBA’s comments reflect the feedback received from businesses and property owners. It would like to express its overall support for the cycling strategy. However, it notes that decisions on specific routes need to be taken holistically in terms of use of limited carriageway/kerbside space and taking account of the needs of all road users. For the business community, accommodating pedestrians in a high quality public realm and maintaining kerbside vehicular access is critical, particularly in light of increasing footfalls as a result of Crossrail and an increase in delivery vehicles.

In relation to Q88, it recognises the willingness of developers on Whitcomb Street to work with the Council to design a mutually agreeable public realm scheme and cycle route. The Jermyn Street route presents some serious challenges for businesses who depend on kerbside deliveries to their premises, who are concerned the cycle route will compromise this. It recommends that businesses are engaged with to understand the difficulties and to
explore alternative routes. HOLBA have concerns in relation to the Jubilee Line which, in
addition to the concerns on Jermyn Street, is considered to be indirect and there are
locations that are concerning due to taxi and private car loading. The Arlington Street
entrance to the Ritz is the principal entrance for the hotel whose guests are picked up and
dropped off at the kerbside. Guests to Fortnum and Mason are dropped off at Duke Street.

15) New West End Company (NWEC)

NWEC commends the Council for its strategy and supports its four principal objectives. It
advocates an approach that puts the needs of the pedestrian first and considers an
overarching priority should be to make the City of Westminster an attractive place for all to
enjoy, promoting walking and cycling as practical alternatives wherever possible. NWEC
made a number of comments on specific objectives:

A) Creating safer and easier to follow routes: NWEC supports the Cycle Grid concept.
However, the use of Bond St as a quietway needs careful consideration as part of the
Bond St study. Bond St, first and foremost, should be considered as a world famous
street for luxury shopping: other uses and users will need to be carefully managed
and directed. It does not want to see cycle contraflow schemes prejudice future two
way vehicular schemes.

B) Encouraging cyclists and other road users to be considerate to each other: NWEC
strongly supports actions B1-9. However, considers these actions will not be enough
given current behaviours observed, with a sea-change in culture and attitude from all
road users. The Council should press central government and the mayor for
significant funding for a major project to start to properly address this issue.

C) Making it easier for people to own and store bikes: NWEC considers the provision of
cycle storage on the footway as a direct conflict with the principle of clutter free
pavements and would support fewer but larger designated cycle parking areas.
Supports off street provision in new developments for employees. Considers that the
train operators could do more to support cycling. Abandoned bikes should be
removed more quickly by the Council – the BIDS could help in the reporting of such
instances. Considers the amount of on street cycle parking in the NWEC area to be
inadequate.

D) Encouraging more people to cycle: To encourage a broader demographic into
cycling, a strong emphasis needs to be given to cycle safety measures which will
need to include both clear diversionary routes which are either fully or semi
separated cycle paths.

8) Paddington Waterside Partnership (PWP) / Paddington BID / Edgware Rd
Partnership

PWP welcomes Westminster’s draft strategy and will give its full support to any cycling
campaigns Westminster run to promote or encourage the take up of cycling.

PWP considers there needs to be more mention of the mainline stations that serve
Westminster, which could be the largest origin/destination of cyclists during peak hours,
particularly in the context of cycle hire movements. Given the stations cycle parking
investment programme, and the number of people employed in the area, PWP would like to see more reference made to the area throughout the strategy. It would also like to see more detailed analysis of the major origins and destinations within Westminster and how the grid links these together.

It also considers that cycling on the canal towpath should not be discouraged as many cyclists find it a safe route away from traffic. Delineation is suggested, where feasible, to minimise conflict between pedestrians and cyclists. Would welcome guidance on how canal towpaths can accommodate increased cycling provision.

PWP considers that the strategy should refer to the recently implemented Harrow Road crossing at Hermitage Street and it should be included on the cycle grid. It is disappointed that Paddington station, Paddington Central and Merchant Square are not directly connected to the grid, given they are large employment areas which are actively encouraging more employees to cycle. They would also like to see all cycle hire sites linked to the grid.

Comments on the cycle grid from Paddington BID:

- Although the alternative Circle Line and Q7 alignments are preferred, it is doubted whether appropriate solutions could be found given the narrow width of these currently one way streets.
- At present cyclists access the station via Arrivals Road, creating conflict with pedestrians and traffic. The BID would support improvements to the London Street / Praed Street junction and to improve connections to the grid.

Comments on the cycle grid from Edgware Road Partnership:

- Welcomes the routes that cross Edgware Road, and anticipates that the improvements will help to improve safety for all users, given current lack of pedestrian phases.
- At present the two large cycle hire stations under Marylebone flyover don’t appear to be connected into the grid and this should be reviewed.

33) Victoria BID

The BID supports the strategy and looks forward to working with the Council to encourage cycling. The strategy should not just be about benefitting cyclists, it should create better places for everyone. It supports the actions around ensuring that road works diversions are safe for cyclists and updating the Code of Construction Practice, and other actions around HGV/cycle safety. The BID has a service level agreement whereby it flags up issues such as signs, bollards and abandoned bikes and it proposes to refresh this to take account of any new response times proposed by the Council to deal with issues that affect cyclists.

It encourages the Council to substantially increase resources for training cyclists, drivers and pedestrians in cycle safety and road use etiquette. Audience segmentation and training packages for different groups are essential, as is regular advertising of these packages. It supports the Council’s proposals to re-establish safety checks and maintenance classes. It suggests establishing cycling points of contacts within businesses who could be used to relay cycle training events details to colleagues.
It welcomes the Council’s proposals to increase on-street cycle parking and suggests that if TfL funding isn’t available, the Council should allocate its own funding towards this. Covered cycle stands should be considered given predictions for increased rainfall. The removal of abandoned bikes is supported. An error in relation to a reference to Figure 5.5 is noted.

The BID welcomes the proposal for a revamp of the cycling webpages and it considers keeping these (and any proposed apps) up to date and well maintained is vital to building trust among cyclists that the resource is worth consulting and re-visiting.

In relation to targeting activity to encourage cycling, a multi-faceted approach that avoids focusing exclusively on one group to the detriment of others is supported.

D. LANDOWNERS / DEVELOPERS

61) The Crown Estate

The Crown Estate strongly endorses the importance of encouraging cycling and supports the objectives of the strategy, permeability improvements and access to the Royal Parks. It also supports actions around cycle training, led cycle rides, the revamped website and the road user reporting tool, all of which it has offered to provide a link to on its occupier websites. The Code of Construction Practice action is supported.

It has a number of comments on specific cycle grid routes. It supports routes within Regents Park, provided that signage and road markings are sensitive to the parks heritage qualities. The Victoria Line quietway and Central Line routes are supported. In relation to the Jermyn Street route, the Panton Street section is supported, there are concerns that the use of Haymarket would result in loss of footway widening if it requires a separate track, and it would oppose the use of Norris Street as it is due to be pedestrianised or St James’s Market. It is concerned that the cycle route will prejudice public realm improvements for the street due to visual impact of cycle route infrastructure, kerbside conflicts. It suggests Charles II Street, St James’s Square and King Street as the preferred route, which is quieter and provides better linkages to the cycle hire sites there. It has concerns regarding the indirectness of the Jubilee Line through St James’s, however St James’s Street has a high volume of traffic and a difficult junction at Piccadilly. It suggests a route through Green Park parallel to Queen’s Walk linking to Clarges Street via the existing crossing. It also has a suggestion of converting the Aldford Street subway to cycle only use to improve links between the East West Cycle Superhighway and Mayfair. It supports the early cycle grid quick wins.

4) Grosvenor Estates

States that their views are generally aligned with those of the WPA. However, would like to emphasise the following points:

- Considers that a decision on the cycling strategy should be made alongside a pedestrian strategy.
- A cost benefit analysis of all the proposed measures is needed, with an emphasis on physical improvements to the network.
- Grosvenor are undertaking a pilot RTF study and are keen for this to include cycling as one of its main outputs. Would like to examine feasibility of two way working on
Upper Brook Street (allowing ‘Central Line’ to be routed along this alignment) to facilitate more direct access to Hyde Park.

- Would like to see the wider proposed Cycle Grid network to see how the routes connect into other boroughs which will help to identify the need for specific measures on these streets.
- Noted that the Council’s views on 20mph zones are inconsistent with those in the RTF which recommends a 20mph zone throughout central London. Grosvenor does not have firm views on the issue. However, it would be concerned if they were introduced on a piecemeal basis with a proliferation of signage.
- The implementation of cycling infrastructure should not prejudice future public realm schemes – flexibility is required.
- The cycle grid should be waymarked in a nominal way. Considered that cyclists will find their own routes and signage should be minimised.

54) Hobhouse SA (freeholder of Hobhouse Court, Whitcomb Street)

It notes that Hobhouse SA will be submitting a planning applications for a number of buildings on Whitcomb Street for new retail, gallery, office and residential uses. It envisages upgrades to the public realm, which means the cycle grid proposals for Q88 are of particular interest. It supports the benefits of improved cycle infrastructure throughout Westminster. It is open to ideas of how a two way cycle route along Whitcomb Street could be accommodated, whether this be via a shared space type arrangement or a more traditional contraflow arrangement. However, it has concerns about the available width and this will need careful consideration and a possible split northbound/southbound route via Orange Street and St Martin’s Street are also mentioned.

56) Knight Brothers Investments (Underground cycle parking provider)

It notes that shortage of bike parking spaces in Westminster, but that there are no plans to alleviate this on a large scale. It recognises the recent and projected increase in cycling and the anticipated increase in people entering central London via Crossrail. It recognises the importance of providing improved routes for cyclists if it is to become attractive to more people. On street cycle parking goes against the grain of decluttering streets and bike theft is also an issue. It considers that conversion of car park spaces could be an option but that these are generally uninviting spaces. A more radical approach is needed, which it considers could be achieved through Knight Brothers Investments product called Eco-cycle, an underground automated cycle storage facility. This is already referred to in the cycle parking case study in the draft strategy, and Knight Brothers Investments provide further more detailed information on the solution as part of their response. It is considered that the Council should incentivise developers to support the provision of mass secure cycle parking under new developments. It should also be incorporated into the master-planning of prominent areas such as Victoria, Oxford Street, and new Crossrail stations at an early stage.

27) Land securities

Welcomes the strategy and recognises need to balance the need of all road users. Cycle parking and cycle hire sites should be placed on the highway, freeing up footways for
pedestrians and cyclists should be prepared to walk an extra 100m to their destination. There are indications that large cycle hubs are to be located at mainline stations. Although the rationale is clear, the objective should be to free up the space and vistas at stations and cycle parking provided at ‘back of house’ areas where space is less of a premium and yet still provides cyclists with reasonable amenity. Existing pedestrian underpasses should be considered for use as cycle parking, with more user friendly pedestrian crossings provided at street level. It is considered that current cycle parking standards in new buildings are sufficient.

The actions around training and behavioural issues are supported. Cyclists should be educated to wear hi-vis jackets and helmets. Enforcement against both cyclists and other road users is essential. Land Sec will continue to offer its support to the Council in this strategy (either directly or via Victoria VID) to facilitate relevant events such as ‘Exchanging Places’.

55) Linseed Assets Ltd (freeholder of Communications House, Leicester Square)

Redevelopment of the above site is due to commence in February 2014 after which it will be converted into retail units and office space. It recognises the benefits of improved cycling infrastructure in Westminster. Its comments relate to Q88 along Whitcomb Street, and it urges the Council to give full consideration to other road users (including pedestrians, delivery/servicing activity and taxis) when bringing forward proposals for two way cycling along the street. It supports strategies to reduce the volume of traffic and the introduction of general calming measures. It lists a number of aspirations for the street including widened, resurfaced and decluttered footways, raised tables, loading pads, and taxi pick up/drop off points. It considers that these proposals can accommodate two way cycle movements and looks forward to further discussions with officers in relation to this.

53) The Portman Estate

It supports the representations made by Westminster Property Association (WPA). It suggests amending the vision to become a national leader in city centre cycling provision, given the grain of the city. In notes in particular that cycling provision should be implemented holistically, alongside other uses of the public realm and that the Council should prioritise walking over other modes, particularly given the predicted impact of Crossrail on pedestrian numbers. It therefore suggests the same priorities as those put forward by the WPA. It would welcome a clear hierarchy of transport priorities within the strategy with cycling shown within the context of other modes. It requests that the Council brings forward the drafting of the Walking Strategy and adopts both policies together to ensure that a balance is struck.

7) Shaftesbury Plc

Shaftesbury are generally in favour of more cycling in Westminster and support the four key objectives proposed as part of the draft strategy.

Objective A (Creating safer and more legible routes) – a network of routes is a good step forward but it should be recognised that regular cyclists will not always follow these and will take the best route for their journey, meaning that the surrounding streets also need consideration. Comments were provided on two of the proposed cycle grid routes:
Q88 – it is noted that the Wardour St/Gerrard St intersection is pedestrianised for part of the day, potentially bringing cyclists into conflict with pedestrians. It is considered that cyclists should be segregated from pedestrians and not come into conflict with them at any time.

Q19 alternative – where the route crosses Cambridge Circus, this needs to be reviewed in line with improvements proposed for this junction. However, the priority should be to improve pedestrian movement at this location.

Objective C (Facilitating bike ownership/parking) – Notes challenge of providing bike parking in an already crowded city, and where bikes are chained to lampposts/railings. Favours on street bike parking replacing car parking, as long as pedestrian permeability is maintained. In terms of cycle parking standards for new development, caution should be used when considering this as a blanket requirement as it is considered that many properties in Westminster are small and therefore not capable of accommodating bike storage.

3) Westminster Property Association

Supports the objectives of the strategy. However, considers that cycling provision needs to be considered holistically alongside other uses of the public realm, in line with the Road’s Task Force recommendations and given projected growth in the population, economy and pedestrian numbers.

For this reason, priority should be making Westminster an attractive city to walk around and enjoy. Recognises that reducing traffic noise and pollution is important and cycling has its part to play in this. Second priority should be given to increasing footway capacity. Cycling measures should be incorporated within every public realm scheme but should only become a dominant design factor, when balanced with public realm benefits, when there is a direct integration with the adopted cycling grid. Future public realm opportunities should not be prejudiced. Importance of servicing also needs to be recognised and innovative ways of reducing vehicles considered. Public transport, buses and taxis are the next priority. Motorised transport (public or private) needs to be discouraged due to the space it takes up, and the noise, pollution and visual clutter it causes.

Considered that the strategy adopts this approach, but this needs reinforcing. Would welcome a clear hierarchy of transport priorities. Would like to see a value for money factor applied to the actions, with the emphasis on practical measures.

Would like to see the walking strategy brought forward and both strategies adopted together to ensure consistency between these, and that a balance is achieved.

A number of detailed comments were provided in relation to specific actions:

- The WPA supports the strategy’s recognition that a balance needs to be struck between catering for different road users, given the nature of Westminster’s streets.

- Creating safer and more legible routes: The WPA supports the principle of the Cycle Grid and increased permeability for cyclists. However, two way vehicular working is supported and cycling contra-flows should not prejudice these schemes coming forward. Under A6 (improved junctions) it needs to be recognised that promoting alternative routes may be part of the solution. Concern that incorporating cycling
measures into all public realm schemes could result in a ‘sprinkled’ approach. Actions around road works and the Code of Construction Practice are supported.

- Improving interaction between road users: The WPA supports all actions in this section. It is suggested that their members may have websites that can support the use of a poor road user conduct reporting tool.

- Facilitating bike ownership, access and parking: The WPA supports all actions in this section, with the exception of C10-12 where they have no comments. It is noted that cycle parking must not be allowed to adversely affect the appearance of Conservation Areas or to obstruct footways. The priority of cycle facilities over residents parking should be explicit.

- Raising awareness/participation in cycling: All actions in this section are supported and it is noted that WPA members may have websites that can be used for communications.

E. LOCAL AUTHORITIES/GOVERNMENT

43) City of Westminster Development Planning Unit

Generally supportive of the strategy, but more detail on budget/implementation programme is required when available. There should be a more general action around encouraging cyclists to look after themselves – such as wearing helmets, high vis clothing, having lights and bells, not undertaking HGVs at junctions etc.

The Council should promote what it has already achieved in relation to cycle parking – both on and off street. Suggests that under used visitor parking bays/single yellow lines should also be considered for conversion to cycle parking. Under Action C4, it is considered that the Council should specifically encourage the use of under-used commercial car parking to be converted to cycle parking. There appear to be inconsistencies in the cycle parking figures quoted. Concerns that the installation of cycle hangars could attract graffiti/vandalism and also with the visual impact. However, it was acknowledged that they would not require planning permission.

47) Environment Agency

Wrote to advise that it has no comments on the Cycling Strategy.

57) London Borough of Camden

Camden welcomes the strategy and Westminster’s commitment to support and grow cycling. However, it considers that cycling needs to be presented more strongly as part of the solution to problems such as congestion and poor air quality. It also ignores that fact that cycling is part of a solution to the increasing demand on carriageway and kerbside in terms of encouraging modal shift, freeing up carriageway space for essential vehicle users. Camden considers that Westminster’s strategy does not strike the right balance and places an overemphasis on the limited kerb space and the need to keep traffic moving. It suggests establishing a road user hierarchy that places cycling about private car use, such as the one established by Camden. It suggests following the Roads Task Force approach of varying priorities according to the time of day, for instance through timed closures or giving higher
priority to cyclists during peak periods. Non essential car use should be actively discouraged or deterred, for instance through reallocation of road space towards physical segregation where possible. It is suggested that whilst this may impact on congestion in the short term, providing an excellent environment for cycling is a key way of supporting cycling. The reallocation of road space also deters car use.

Camden welcomes Westminster’s commitment to keeping 20 mph hour limits under review and encourages it to join other boroughs adopting these limits to help provide consistency across London. The cycling strategy should give greater emphasis to Westminster Cycling Campaign’s involvement in the process as a key stakeholder.

In relation the proposed cycle grid routes, it would like to see New Cavendish or Clipstone Street made two way, an additional east-west alignment in the vicinity of Oxford Street, it would like to see Q19 connect to Great Queen Street. It has concerns regarding the use of Shelton Street for Q19 as it is narrow with high footfalls and cobbles and would instead like to see Long Acre or Earlham Street considered instead.

13) London Borough of Southwark

Southwark Council supports the strategy. It would welcome stronger borough liaison in relation to route and infrastructure improvements to ensure consistency across the cycle network. It would also welcome a review of Westminster’s current position on 20mph zones, although it is recognised that at certain times of the day traffic speeds are already below this.

16) Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (RBKC)

RBKC supports the delivery of the London Cycle Grid and is looking forward to working on routes in the vicinity of the borough boundary. It showed interest in the Council’s cycle parking finder tool and the possible development of this into an app, and also the Council’s plans to convert under-used residents parking into cycle parking facilities and a bike loan scheme. Support the Council’s plan to lobby TfL to expand the cycle hire area into the north west as this fits with RBKC’s aspirations.

It is happy to share lessons learnt from its Bikeminded project (featured as a case study in the strategy) and says that it has found that social media is a fast and effective way to both relay their messages and connect with residents. The led rides associated with this project have also proven very popular and have been a good way of introducing new cyclists to quieter routes in the borough.

RBKC have developed a campaign called ‘Light Angel’, which through social media channels, invites cyclists to become ‘light angels’ handing out free bike lights to fellow cyclists who may be riding without lights on their bikes. The lights are funded by the Council as a way of promoting a safe cycling culture amongst residents. RBKC hopes that the Council’s idea for a poor road user conduct reporting tool will be supported and embraced by the police.

Would welcome a discussion on the Council’s proposed monitoring programme and to identify potential opportunities for collaboration.

The Royal Parks (TRP)
The TRP broadly supports the draft cycling strategy. It sees opportunities to work closely with Westminster on the delivery of its targets. TRP has sought to engage with cyclists with bike week events and a range of partnership projects which it will seek to continue.

In relation to the Cycle Grid, TRP has concerns about the carrying capacity of certain routes through the Parks and the feasibility of some of the new proposed routes. For instance, feasibility studies carried out on Queen’s Walk in Green Park have consistently identified significant design issues, especially at the northern exit on to Piccadilly, and TRP urges reconsideration of this report. In Hyde Park TRP has been clear that any new large volume cycle routes should be highway based on North, West and South Carriage Drives, rather than encouraging increased use of existing shared use paths such as Rotten Row. Regarding Q19, the proposed route from Queen Mothers Gate, north to the Curzon Gate pedestrian crossing of Park Lane is difficult to accommodate within the Park and it is suggested that a better option is to make provision on a widened section of footpath alongside Park Lane.

**Transport for London (Borough Projects and Programmes)**

Is impressed by how quickly the Council has embraced the Mayor’s Cycling Vision and quickly translated it into schemes currently in their design stage. It is recognised that this is not easy given the sheer number of competing demand on the Westminster road network. It considers the strategy is well written and structured and has a clear plan to support the growth in cycling and making it safer. The vision is inspiring and ambitious yet achievable. Motorised vehicles account for three quarters of collisions and driver behaviour, plus visibility and behaviour of cyclists need to be addressed through constant campaigns and information. Appendix would benefit from showing the rate of cyclist collisions, which is probably decreasing. In Appendix 8 it is worth noting the impact that recent improvements may have made on the clusters identified. Suggests talking to TfL about Grosvenor Place, which appears to be a collision hotspot and it is considered this should be on the grid given it is an obvious north-south link.

TfL is encouraged to see the prominence given to cycle parking in the document. It suggests that it maybe possible to reallocate funding from other cycle parking budgets to support Westminster’s aspirations. The strategy of building the grid supported by promotion and information are central to achieving the strategy’s target growth in cycling. TfL is happy to comment on scheme designs to ensure they afford the highest possible level of protection for cyclists at junctions, while also meeting the needs of other road users such as buses and taxis.

**F. OTHER**

5) Royal Commission for the Exhibition 1851 and the Royal Albert Hall (submitted by Allies and Morrison on their behalf)

Noted that they are working on the ‘Re-imagining Albertopolis’ project, which seeks to implement improvements to the public realm surrounding the Royal Albert Hall.

The strategy’s four core objectives are supported, particularly the first two, which will improve the quality of Albertopolis’ visitor experience. The three actions under the first objective (creating safer and more legible routes) that are considered most important are the
introduction of the Cycle Grid, improving routes for cyclists entering and leaving parks and making improvements at road junctions.

In relation to the proposed Cycle Grid routes, it is considered that the proposed new routes through Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens could have a positive impact on cycling in the Albertopolis area, if these can encourage cyclists to use quieter routes away from Kensington Gore. It is noted that the Albertopolis project has considered similar improvements to those put forward in the Westminster Cycling Strategy in the vicinity of the entrances to Kensington Garden, and it could therefore contribute to delivering these proposals.

The importance of minimising conflict between pedestrians and cyclists is noted, particularly in the context of improving the pedestrian experience in the area between the Royal Albert Hall and the Albert Memorial. It is therefore suggested that the strategy should explicitly mention the need to carefully consider the interaction between pedestrians and cyclists at tourist hotspots, such as Albertopolis.

18) Thames Water Utilities Ltd (TWUL)

TWUL are supportive of the cycling strategy. However it has concerns regarding the delivery timescales for the CSH E-W route as it could conflict with the works to build the Thames Tideway Tunnel (TTT), which will require the closure of sections of Victoria Embankment. Discussions will take place with TfL as detailed design is developed. TWUL would welcome Westminster’s involvement in this process.

42) Clean Air London (CAL)

It applauds the Council for its proposed cycle grid which protects cyclists from the worst air pollution and other risks on red routes. CAL considers this the biggest and boldest move that the Council has taken in the last 8 years to improve air quality. This should be considered a ‘primary’ cycle network, with a ‘secondary’ network developed within 1-2 years, equal in scale and ambition. The KA urges the Council to adopt a 20mph speed limit across the borough by early 2015. Two way cycling on one way streets should also be permitted. It refers to the Great College Street scheme in Camden in terms of a style and cost of scheme that should be replicated. It urges the Council to ask the Royal Parks to develop a cycle network through its parks, which backed by enforcement to protect pedestrians, are the safest and best places for cyclists. A large campaign to promote the grid and build public understanding of the dangers of poor air quality is needed. Ambitious targets for cycling journeys should be set for each year up to 2020.

46) Natural England

Natural England does not consider that the strategy poses any likely or significant risk to those features of the natural environment, and therefore only has one comment: current and proposed cycle routes present an opportunity for improving Green Infrastructure (GI) and Green Chains, which would be beneficial to both the environment in the area and local residents in the vicinity of the routes, and as such should be improved wherever possible.

49) English Heritage
Supports the strategy’s vision and actions. Notes that the impact on the historic environment is largely confined to proposals for physical alternations including cycle lanes, junction improvements and wayfinding. It suggests that these are developed in accordance with the Westminster Way. It would promote the opportunity to remove redundant street furniture and implement high quality new works which provide attractive, safe and legible streets, and enhance Westminster’s exceptional historic character. English Heritage would be pleased to offer more detailed advice on those schemes which affect the historic environment at their development stage.
## Comments on Westminster's Draft Cycling Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7, 37</td>
<td>Action C4</td>
<td>Partnership working with Westminster businesses will encourage them to consider the installation of cycle parking for employees within their buildings...</td>
<td>There is more likely to be a positive outcome if businesses are encouraged to install cycle parking rather than consider it!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Action D1</td>
<td>The Council’s cycling web pages will be revamped.</td>
<td>We are pleased to hear that the web pages will be revamped. However, it is what happens in the real world that counts!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Flowchart 1</td>
<td>Delivery Challenges: Often insufficient width to provide segregation</td>
<td>A bit of an exaggeration! We suggest 'Sometimes insufficient width to provide segregation.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Car ownership data for Westminster shows an increase in the number of households who do not own a car from 56% in 2001 to 63% in 2011. Between 2000 and 2012, there was a 150% increase in cyclists passing through a central London screenline cordon.</td>
<td>These data show the cultural change that is taking place in travel habits. Road management policy needs to take account of this change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>There has been an average decrease in traffic on Westminster’s main roads over the last five years. On some roads this decrease is over 20%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>What potential is there for change?</td>
<td>Although this section quite rightly considers the potential change among Westminster residents, it rather ignores commuters - either those that cycle in or those that come in…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 18   | 3.4     | Greater emphasis must be placed, therefore, on making cyclists feel safer on London’s roads and reducing accident casualties.  
We totally agree. |
| 19   | 3.5     | Congestion and journey time reliability on Westminster’s A Roads have worsened slightly over the last five years. These figures are amongst the worst in London, with only the City of London, Camden and Islington having lower speeds and higher journey times. This indicates that other influences are likely to be affecting capacity on Westminster’s A Roads, such as increasing pedestrian, cyclist and bus passenger volumes...  
There appears to be some confusion of congestion and speed. There may be reasons other than congestion for lower speeds, for example stopping at signals and driving at an appropriate speed for the circumstances.  
It is less likely that cyclists will cause an increase in journey times on Westminster’s A roads, since these are generally wider and do not (until now) generally have space reserved for cyclists. |
| 21   | 4.1 A   | Cycle routes will be, as far as is possible, direct, legible, coherent, attractive and comfortable to use.  
We are pleased to see that the criteria have now been extended to the usual five.  
We are very concerned that the Strategy does not refer to the forthcoming updated London Cycle Design Standards, and to aligning the routes delivered in Westminster to the Level of Service to be specified there. |
| 22   | 4.1 D   | High level target - to achieve a 7% modal share for cycling by 2026, for trips originating in Westminster.  
We are very pleased that the Council has revised the target upwards from the previous version of the Cycling Strategy. Westminster is currently at 3%, while Hackney, with the highest cycling modal share in London, is currently at 6%. So Westminster, within 13 years, has to become more cycle-friendly than Hackney is now! |
| 24   | 5 A     | The Council will seek, within the constraints of Westminster’s historic street environment, to deliver these improvements through the Amsterdam manages to provide for cyclists pretty well despite multiple challenges.  
And Westminster has shown what can be
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>5A</th>
<th>implementation of a Central London Cycling Grid.</th>
<th>done in Hanover Street and Long Acre (east). See separate comments on the detail of the Central London Grid.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 25   | 5A | ‘Quietways’ – are less busy but reasonably direct routes linked to Superhighways and are aimed at novice, less confident cyclists who are not comfortable cycling in busy traffic and don’t mind cycling at a more relaxed pace. | Although it is very important that Quietways should appeal to less experienced cyclists, they will also be used by more experienced cyclists who want a convenient, safe and pleasant experience. In order for Quietways to appeal to less experienced cyclists, it is important that:  
   a. There should be a dense network of on-road cycle routes. The network appears to be less dense in Westminster than in Southwark, the City and Camden, especially in Mayfair and Marylebone.  
   b. Those routes should be of a high quality.  
   The London Cycling Campaign has a policy that:  
   a. Cyclists should not be expected to share space with motor vehicles moving above 20mph.  
   b. If cyclists will share space with motor traffic, volumes must be low. On the core cycle route network this should not exceed the Dutch maximum for main cycle routes, 2,000 Passenger Car Units per day.  
   Depending on the function and the nature of the road, there a number of ways that these criteria can be met, for example, through modal filtering, by imposing speed limits or on busier roads through segregation. |
| 25   | 5A | On some busier stretches of road, fully segregated cycle lanes and/or improved junctions may be required. Again, consideration will need to be given to what kerbside access is required on a street (e.g. for buses or servicing), what the traffic impact will be and whether this can be accommodated... | The priority given to motor traffic has made so many of Westminster’s roads so hostile to cycling. The cultural changes in travel habits, recorded elsewhere in the Strategy, suggest that other priorities are now appropriate. And a city stuffed full of fuming motor vehicles isn’t just hostile to cycling. It becomes an unpleasant and unsafe place to walk, live, work and shop.  
If Westminster were to reduce motor traffic, pressure on carriageway space would be |
| 25 | 5 A | A Central London Grid | The quality of the road surface is an important factor in the quality of a cycle route. As well as being unpleasant to ride over, a distressed road surface can be dangerous for cyclists if it causes them to swerve to avoid defects, with the risk of collision with other vehicles. We therefore suggest that, when a street is designated as part of the Central London Grid, its surface should be brought up to an acceptable standard. |

| 25 | 5 A | A Central London Grid | Westminster has a large number signal-controlled junctions. Where there are a number of these along a road, their phasing is often programmed so that motor vehicles will encounter a series of green signals. This means that cyclists, travelling at a slower speed, are more likely to encounter one or more red signals. As well as lengthening journey times, this causes cyclists to lose momentum - an important consideration for a self-propelled form of transport. We therefore support the removal of traffic signals at junctions where they can safely be replaced with other measures, such as give-way lines or mini roundabouts. |

| 25 | 5 A | A Central London Grid | The Strategy understates the potential value of the Grid to pedestrians. |

A street that is pleasant to cycle along is also likely to be pleasant to walk along.

A street with a higher proportion of cycles and a lower proportion of motor vehicles is going to be less noisy and less polluted.

It can be difficult for pedestrians to find their way around and quite a few already use TfL’s cycling maps for this purpose. So it will be useful for pedestrians to have signposted routes to destinations beyond the immediate destination.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>5 A</td>
<td>In partnership with the Royal Parks, the Council will also seek to improve access points to cycle routes in the Royal Parks from the highway, given their high use for leisure cycling, and will also seek to minimise conflict with pedestrians at these busy access points.</td>
<td>The council could also do more to allow cycling in its own parks that are suitable for it, in particular Paddington Recreation Ground and St Mary's Churchyard. As well as providing useful local routes, these parks would also be a good place for families to cycle with children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>5 A</td>
<td>The Council also intends to annually review where accidents involving cyclists are taking place on Westminster’s streets... Some of the above junctions fall on the Central London Cycling Grid so solutions will be developed for these as part of the wider scheme for that corridor. Where the locations fall outside of this process the Council will develop solutions separately.</td>
<td>This is very important, since cyclists will be using roads other than the Central London Grid. The junctions listed are major obstacles to cycling and badly need to be made safer for cycling. This policy is also an appropriate response to the recent series of fatalities among cyclists on Central London roads. See also comments on Appendix 8 below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>5 A</td>
<td>20mph Zones</td>
<td>The London Cycling Campaign continues to believe that a 20mph limit not only reduces the risk and severity of injury to vulnerable road users but also results in a better environment for everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>5 B</td>
<td>Cycle Training Events</td>
<td>We are pleased that Westminster will continue to provide cycle training for adults and children. It is disappointing, however, that the investment in training children has not resulted in a significant increase in the number of children cycling on the road. Although current cycling conditions must be a major factor, we believe that that cycling activities for children, as organized by Camden for example, would boost cycle use among children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>5 B</td>
<td>The Council will commit to incorporating these conditions [i.e. that they are Bronze members of FORS, that vehicles are fitted with the appropriate safety equipment and</td>
<td>We are very pleased that Westminster has made this commitment. As we know, collision with large vehicles is the most common cause of fatalities among cyclists. Anything that can</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that drivers have received practical cycle safety awareness training and have their licenses checked on a regular basis] into all new or renewed Council contracts that involve the operation of vehicles within Westminster, starting with the highways and transportation contract re-lets, due to come into operation in April 2014 (see Appendix 9 for the conditions that will be incorporated). The Council will also work with existing contractors to help them meet these standards.

This section rather ignores the requirement for cycle parking at stations. Although parking on stations may be the responsibility of the station operator, local authorities are very often involved in initiatives to increase cycle parking on stations.

We welcome this policy. In some streets, footways are too narrow for cycle parking stands to be installed; so putting them in the carriageway is a good solution.

We would welcome the introduction of these schemes - and not only because they enable people to try cycling without a significant capital outlay. Re-using abandoned bikes releases cycle parking space and recycles useful parts and materials.

We note that very few trips started or finished at Victoria Station. We conclude that this is because:

a. There are not many cycle hire stations near Victoria (in contrast with Waterloo, for example).

b. Because of the road system, it is difficult to get in or out of Victoria on a bike.

We therefore suggest that these deficiencies should be remedied.
Appendices

Raising awareness and participation in cycling
We can understand the council's dilemma whether to target groups primed for cycling or those whose health (and finances) are most likely to benefit from cycling. We therefore agree that it is important to promote cycling not only through the website but also through other media.

Advice on indoor/outdoor storage solutions For Council tenants, how to request cycle parking
For private tenants, how to approach the landlord / freeholder
How to request access to an on-street bike hangar
We believe these are very important. Many Westminster residents live in flats and finding somewhere to store a bike can be a significant obstacle to taking up cycling.
Installing cycle parking stands near someone's home is a good way of selling cycling.

KPIs: Section A – Creating safer and more legible routes
Percentage of Westminster Cycle Grid network completed.
Monitor annually Targets: 50% by 2016, 100% by 2020
We note that these targets represent a very rapid rate of progress and trust that the Council will have sufficient resources to achieve that rate.

We need some way of measuring whether Westminster has progressed towards its goal of being a 'national leader'. There are different ways this could be done. All designated cycle routes could be audited against TfL's Level of Service criteria in the forthcoming London Cycle Design Standards. Or, the entire potential network of routes for cyclists (including park links) could be assessed in relation to key volume and speed criteria, such as those developed by the London Cycling Campaign. What proportion of this network allows cyclists to ride in both directions without having to mix with fast or busy motor traffic (or dismount and walk)?

Bike Hangars. This fee varies by borough but is typically up to £60, plus a £25 key deposit.
Bearing in mind that two bike hangars with six spaces each can occupy the same space as one car parking bay, this charge seems expensive, compared with the cost of a resident's car parking permit. It is also more than the cost of resident's parking permit for a motorcycle in Westminster. An annual fee of £15 and a key deposit of £15, as charged by Tower Hamlets on the previous page, seems more reasonable.

These locations correspond very closely to...
in last 36 months

The results of a survey by the London Cycling Campaign. Cyclists were asked to nominate locations most in need of improvement. The following were the most popular choices:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Nominations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldwych / Strand</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park Corner</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayswater Road</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster Gate</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament Square</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Bridge</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrow Road</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafalgar Square</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marble Arch</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7 – Summary of comments received in relation to specific cycle grid routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Description of location (link or junction)</th>
<th>Total number of comments (S = survey, I = written individual, O = organisations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concerns that the current Jubilee Line route through St James’s is too circuitous</td>
<td>48 (S=43, I=1, O=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hyde Park (various suggestions regarding improvements)</td>
<td>40 (S=33, I=4, O=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Park (support for the use of Queens Walk)</td>
<td>29 (S=25, I=2, O=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hyde Park Corner (mainly relating to the delays to cyclists from the traffic signals)</td>
<td>21 (S=19, I=2, O=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kensington Gardens (support for its use to avoid Bayswater Road)</td>
<td>18 (S=14, I=3, O=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St James Street (support for its use to avoid circuitous route to the east)</td>
<td>17 (S=13, I=0, O=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Cavendish Street (support for its use as a more direct east-west route)</td>
<td>15 (S=12, I=1, O=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trafalgar Square (concern over lack of facilities for cyclists)</td>
<td>14 (S=14, I=0, O=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regents Park (various suggestions regarding improvements and better access)</td>
<td>14 (S=12, I=1, O=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parliament Square (concern over lack of facilities for cyclists)</td>
<td>14 (S=13, I=1, O=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northumberland Avenue (need for improved link between Trafalgar Square and the E-W Cycle Super Highway)</td>
<td>9 (S=7, I=1, O=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jermyn Street (concern over impact on deliveries and the urban realm)</td>
<td>8 (S=5, I=0, O=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Brook Street/Grosvenor Square</td>
<td>7 (S=4, I=0, O=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marble Arch (need for improved facilities for cyclists)</td>
<td>6 (S=6, I=0, O=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chelsea Bridge (suggested shared facility on the eastern footway)</td>
<td>5 (S=5, I=0, O=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blomfield Road (support for proposed route)</td>
<td>4 (S=3, I=0, O=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Portland Street/Portland Place (suggested more direct north-south route)</td>
<td>4 (S=3, I=0, O=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bond Street (concern over conflict with pedestrians and servicing/deliveries)</td>
<td>4 (S=3, I=1, O=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cambridge Circus (need for improved facilities and conflict with pedestrians)</td>
<td>3 (S=2, I=0, O=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whitehall (suggestions for improved facilities for cyclists)</td>
<td>3 (S=2, I=0, O=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strand (suggestions for improved facilities for cyclists)</td>
<td>3 (S=3, I=0, O=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whitcomb Street – Q88 (impact of new developments resulting from</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
construction and final schemes) | (S=0, I=0, O=3)  
---|---  
Wardour Street (concern over conflicts in the pedestrianised area) | 2  
| (S=0, I=0, O=2)  
Lancaster Gate (concern over lack of facilities for cyclists) | 2  
| (S=2, I=0, O=0)  

**Table 2**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route name</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Response and Proposed actions (in blue)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>East/West Routes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quietway 7 and Circle Line (between Westbourne Terrace and Sale Place)</td>
<td>Suggestion is to use Craven Road, Spring Street, Conduit Place and Star Street as an alternative to Sussex Gardens</td>
<td>This was considered during development of the draft grid but concern was raised over conflict with heavy bus flows on Craven Road and conflicts with pedestrians in the vicinity of Paddington station. Route via Sussex Gardens is, therefore, preferred. Integration with Paddington station will be reviewed as Crossrail works complete by 2018. The works to Sussex Gardens will need to be accounted for in the proposed phasing of the implementation of the grid. This will include addressing the impact of construction traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quietway 7 (New Cavendish Street)</td>
<td>New Cavendish Street was raised by a number of individuals (and Camden) as being a more direct east-west link</td>
<td>This link was included in the grid as an alternative to the link to the south via Duchess Street. Discussions will continue with Camden to determine the best way to link with a continuation eastwards. This will also need to take on board the review of Upper Brook Street and Grosvenor Square and links to the west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Union Canal (between Delamere Terrace and Maida Vale)</td>
<td>Support was received for the proposed route via Blomfield Road and continuation via Delamere Terrace to the west</td>
<td>A scheme for contraflow facilities has been developed and residents were consulted. As a result of comments received, changes have been made to the scheme prior to further consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Union Alternative and Jubilee Line (Charlbert)</td>
<td>The suggestion was to use this link as an alternative to Townsend Road to the east</td>
<td>The use of Charlbert Street was considered as part of the development of the grid but was thought to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street)</td>
<td>as it would result in a more direct route</td>
<td>unsuitable due to alignment with the narrow bridge into Regents Park and potential conflict with pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Line (Upper Brook Street)</td>
<td>Suggestions were made that this should become 2-way for cyclists rather than splitting the route with Upper Grosvenor Street</td>
<td>This was considered during development of the grid but issues were identified regarding kerbside activities and the crossing of Park Lane and links to Hyde Park. However, this route will be reviewed in association with the future of Grosvenor Square, the American Embassy and Brook Street (see also comments on New Cavendish Street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quietway 19 (Cambridge Circus)</td>
<td>Concerns were raised regarding the conflicts at Cambridge Circus in relation to heavy traffic (particularly buses) and pedestrians. Camden has also raised concerns regarding the links to the east and has suggested some alternative alignments</td>
<td>The operation of Cambridge Circus is currently being reviewed and any cycle facilities will need to be addressed. In order to reduce conflicts there may be alternative options for getting cyclists across Charing Cross Road. These will also need to address the continuation eastwards and links with Camden. Discussions will continue with Camden to determine the best route for Q19 between the Soho and Covent Garden areas via Cambridge Circus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jermyn Street route and Jubilee Line (part) (Jermyn Street)</td>
<td>Concern was expressed regarding the impact that any scheme might have on the servicing of adjacent properties as well as conflict with pedestrians.</td>
<td>The currently tabled scheme is considered to address these concerns. However, the Jubilee and Victoria Lines need further investigation in this area (see comments above) before deciding on the most appropriate routes so these comments will be taken on board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jermyn Street and Quietway 68 (Drury Lane)</td>
<td>Suggestions were made for the realignment of Quietway 68 to avoid the conflict with pedestrians at the junction between Wellington Street and the Strand. Issues were also raised with regard to conditions on Strand/Aldwych</td>
<td>The alternative Drury Lane alignment will be investigated further. This will is likely to be dependent on any emerging proposals for the Strand/Aldwych gyratory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North/South Routes</td>
<td>Support was received for the proposed route through Green Park via Queens Walk (this was specifically mentioned on the proposed grid plan)</td>
<td>Discussions with the Royal Parks on the suitability of a route will continue. There are, however, issues to resolve with regard to the access at Piccadilly together with a suitable crossing point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubilee Line and Victoria Lines (between The Mall and Oxford Street)</td>
<td>Numerous comments were made regarding the circuitous nature of the Jubilee Line between The Mall and Oxford Street. Many felt that cyclists would be keen to use the more direct route of St James Street and Albermarle Street.</td>
<td>The Jubilee Line through St James’s area and the Victoria Line through Green Park (and onward connections) were thoroughly investigated as part of the development of the grid. However, there are numerous competing demands on the available road space in this key central area and it therefore needs further investigation before deciding the best route(s) through this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubilee Line and Cycle Superhighway 11 (Regents Park)</td>
<td>Various comments were made supporting both the proposed routes and suggesting improved access.</td>
<td>Discussions will continue with the Royal Parks to determine the best routes through Regents Park taking on board the various suggestions made. This will also include reviewing the various access points and links with the grid network (see also comment on the use of Charlbert Street).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubilee Line and E-W Cycle Superhighway (Parliament Square)</td>
<td>Concerns were raised about the lack of facilities for cyclists and conflicts with heavy traffic, particularly buses.</td>
<td>These comments will be passed to TfL to take on board in the development of the E-W Cycle Superhighway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubilee Line (New Bond Street)</td>
<td>Concern was expressed with regard to potential conflict with pedestrians and servicing requirements.</td>
<td>An alternative alignment to the east was included in the grid plan that utilises Harley Street to the north. However, the Jubilee and Victoria Lines need further investigation (see above) to the south of this area before deciding on the best routes and links.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quietway 88 (Trafalgar Square)</td>
<td>Concerns were raised about the lack of facilities for cyclists and conflicts with heavy traffic, particularly buses.</td>
<td>(see comments on Northumberland Avenue below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quietway 88 (Wardour Street)</td>
<td>Concern has been raised in relation to allowing cyclists to use the pedestrianised section of Wardour Street during the restricted hours and conflicts with pedestrians.</td>
<td>The current proposal is to allow cyclists to use Wardour Street in both directions but with minimal infrastructure interventions. This is likely to result in pedestrians taking priority particularly during busy times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quietway 88 (Whitcomb Street)</td>
<td>Letters have been received on behalf of the developers of major redevelopment sites on Whitcomb Street between Coventry Street and Pall Mall East. Support is given in principle but with</td>
<td>Quietway 88 via Whitcomb Street will be subject to ongoing discussions with developers to help integrate the cycling proposals with the emerging public realm improvements. The impact of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superhighway</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cycle</strong></td>
<td><strong>Northumberland</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quietway 88</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cycle</strong></td>
<td><strong>Northumberland</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tufton</strong></td>
<td><strong>Street</strong></td>
<td><strong>was suggested as an alternative to Marsham Street as it is quieter and not on a bus route</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-W Cycle Superhighway</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hyde Park</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cycle</strong></td>
<td><strong>as including Hyde Park Superhighway</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lancaster Gate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cycle</strong></td>
<td><strong>Regency Superhighway</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hyde Park Corner</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cycle</strong></td>
<td><strong>as including Hyde E-W Cycle Superhighway</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Routes/comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kensington Gardens</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northumberland Avenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marble Arch</td>
<td>Concerns were raised about the lack of facilities for cyclists and conflicts with heavy traffic, particularly buses and pedestrians</td>
<td>Any facilities here will need to take on board the emerging proposals from TfL for Marble Arch and links with the proposed north-south route via Great Cumberland Place. These comments will be passed to TfL to take on board in the development of the scheme for Marble Arch as part of the Better Junctions Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Bridge</td>
<td>Suggestions were to develop a shared facility on the footway on the east of Chelsea Bridge which would also provide a link with Grosvenor Road, part of the Cycle Superhighway network</td>
<td>These comments will be passed to TfL to take on board in the development of the Cycle Superhighway on Grosvenor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Portland Street</td>
<td>Suggestion was to use Great Portland Street as a north-south link between Euston Road and Oxford Street</td>
<td>This link carries relatively heavy traffic and is 1-way southbound between Euston Road and New Cavendish Street. The preferred north-south route is, therefore, Cleveland Street to the east which is relatively lightly trafficked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne Terrace, Bishop’s Bridge Road and Norfolk Place</td>
<td>These links were suggested as a means of improving access to Paddington station together with the various offices in the area.</td>
<td>While these links experience heavy traffic and/or bus use and would not, therefore, be appropriate as part of the grid, there is merit in trying to provide facilities to improve access. The Council will, therefore, consider if any improvements can be made outside of the grid programme to improve access for cyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leinster Gardens</td>
<td>The suggestion was to provide a route through the housing development at the northern end of Leinster Gardens</td>
<td>Although not part of the grid, the Council is willing to consider if any improvements can be made outside of the grid programme to improve access for cyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garway Road/St Petersburgh Place</td>
<td>A suggestion was made for Garway Road/St Petersburgh Place to provide a new north-south link between Bayswater Road and Westbourne Grove</td>
<td>This was considered as part of the development of the grid but ruled out due to issues at Bayswater Road and not aligning with a continuation of the grid to the south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Suggested Link Details</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Avenue/Sutherland Road/Warwick Avenue/Warrington Crescent (additional routes providing links to the Grand Union Alternative)</td>
<td>The Canal and River Trust suggested a number of specific links to/from the Grand Union Alternative route:  - Elgin Avenue - heavy bus use but wide carriageway  - Sutherland Avenue - provides link to Harrow Road  - Warwick Avenue - provides link to Blomfield Road  - Warrington Green</td>
<td>Whilst not part of the grid, these links would provide improved connections, particularly with Harrow Road. They will, therefore, be investigated as part of the development of the route to improve access and encourage usage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington Recreation Ground and St Marys Church</td>
<td>Suggestions were to improve access and facilities to encourage cyclists to use both these areas</td>
<td>Cycling in these areas is not currently permitted due to concerns over the impact on pedestrian safety in these relatively constrained spaces where there is limited scope for path widening. However, officers will review this in conjunction with the Parks and Sports &amp; Leisure teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupus Street/Claverton Street</td>
<td>It was suggested that these could form additional grid links to help connect Cycle Superhighway 8 with cycle Superhighway 5.</td>
<td>This will therefore be raised with TfL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarges Street/ Chesterfield Hill</td>
<td>The suggestion relates to a potential crossing of Piccadilly and links with Green Park together with a continuation northwards</td>
<td>The crossing of Piccadilly will need to take account of any proposed routes in Green Park, which will be discussed with the Royal Parks. However, the use of Chesterfield Hill does not appear to provide a link to the grid or a suitable alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grosvenor Place (additional route between Hyde park Corner and Victoria)</td>
<td>A number of respondents suggested an additional route along Grosvenor Place, including TfL whose network it falls on.</td>
<td>This route would appear to offer a useful and direct link between Hyde Park Corner and Victoria. TfL has also recently commissioned a study into access to Victoria by cyclists on the back of the Victoria Vision initiative. This suggestion will, therefore, be raised with TfL for further consideration as their response to the consultation indicated support for its inclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall</td>
<td>Suggestions for facilities for cyclists</td>
<td>This is an important bus route linking Parliament Square with Trafalgar Square and is heavily trafficked, and therefore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 8 - Map showing spread of comments on the cycle grid alignments