

RESPONSE FROM HFCYCLISTS / LCC to WESTFIELD'S DRAFT CYCLING STRATEGY

1 Executive summary

1.1 It is good that this Draft Cycling Strategy deals so thoroughly with access to the Westfield site by segregated means. It also deals with cycle parking.

The emphasis in the strategy is on keeping cyclists off the road and driving them through other areas, some of which would otherwise be used by pedestrians. It treats the roads in the area as not recommended for cyclists.

The east-west route is an important link in the LCN+, and is, de facto, a main thoroughfare for cyclists going into Central London. Many cyclists use the carriageway and policies exist to increase the ratio of cyclists to other traffic.

The changes to the road layout appear to increase the danger to cyclists.

The roadway should be used for the movement of traffic. We suggest that by the judicious use of lane widths cyclists can get through congested traffic, and be out of the way when the traffic is moving. What should be avoided is lanes clogged with traffic and cyclists not able to get through.

If the traffic is so tight that cyclists cannot get through it also means that there is no give in the traffic that would allow emergency vehicles through. Using the roadway to unnecessarily store queuing traffic will add to the pollution in the area. [there are indications that the Uxbridge rd may revert from 3 lanes back to 4.]

The strategy appears to have been selective in its interpretation of relevant policy, and fails to give adequate consideration to the needs of cyclists as vulnerable users.

The strategy appears to be based on a road plan that is different from the present geography. This may be an out of date road layout, and if this is so, may invalidate some aspects of the strategy. Otherwise there are plans that no one knows about to reduce the widths of the pavement.

We include a considered response to their proposals for cyclists, with suggestions for possible improvements.

This strategy for Cycling appears to be an after thought. Cycling should have been an integrated part of the design process. The strategy does not mitigate the problems that the extra traffic will bring to cyclists using the carriageway.

It appears that this draft strategy fails to meet the legal obligations from which it arose.

2 The Westfield Shoppingtowns Ltd development and the strategy

2.1 WhiteCity will be the largest shopping mall in Europe within an urban area, and the third largest shopping centre in the UK behind MetroCentre and Bluewater.

This is expected to open in late 2008 [perhaps now 2009] with parking spaces for 4,500 cars.

The development will add to the traffic in the SBG / HPR area. There is periodic congestion in this area, and the congestion will increase in extent and duration.

An application for a further 18,500sqm of retail space has been filed. This increased floor space, giving a total of 110,773 sqm, will bring further traffic.

The Southern Interchange is the transport hub comprising the Central Line station, the West London Line station and the bus station near the Holland Park Roundabout. This will change the road layout.

Halcrow have produced a cycling strategy for Westfield covering access to the site and cycle parking.

It is very good that this Draft Cycling Strategy deals so thoroughly with access to the site by segregated means, and cycle parking.

However it appears to do little to help mitigate the problems that the extra traffic will bring to cyclists who need to pass through the area.

3 Planning context

3.1 The Draft Cycling Strategy comes from Westfield's planning Application to LBHF, 2006/03367/VAR, for an extra 18,500sqm of retail space.

The legal agreement for this can be seen in the LBHF planning committee agenda for 28 March 07, at http://www.lbhf.gov.uk/Images/Final_agenda_28_03_07_tcm21-78057.pdf

4.0 LEGAL AGREEMENT Highways and Transport Initiatives

4.11 The proposed increase in retail floorspace is likely to have some additional impacts on our local road network, even though no additional customer parking is proposed. Westfield have indicated that they would contribute £1.65m towards a CPZ review, public transport improvements, pedestrian, cycling and environmental improvements and traffic management schemes in the Shepherds Bush area.

3.2 Westfield has also filed an application for the Southern Interchange, Application No 2007/02266/FUL. Drawings can be seen in appendix A of the supporting documents.

3.3 These planning applications can be seen by putting the appropriate Application No in the search field of

http://www.apps.lbhf.gov.uk/PublicAccess/tdc/DcApplication/application_searchform.aspx

4 Section 278 agreements

4.1 I understand that under a section 278 agreement the developer pays but it is the highway authority that is actually responsible for the designs and builds the highway. I understand that where signals and capacity are concerned it is the role of TfL or the signals people to make the final decisions, even on borough roads. This includes the number of lanes and lane widths.

Guidance on agreements with the Secretary of State under section 278 of the Highways Act 1980

Introduction

1. Agreements for the private-sector funding of works on the strategic road network are made under section 278 of the Highways Act 1980, as amended by section 23 of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. These agreements provide a financial mechanism for ensuring delivery of mitigation works identified and determined as necessary for planning permission to be granted. It does not mean that the Highways Agency will support a developer in any planning application or subsequent proceedings.

<http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/regional/strategy/policy/guidance/section278highwaysact?page=1>

5 Policies that promote on-road cycling

5.1 THE LONDON CYCLING ACTION PLAN

TFL'S priorities will be to address the needs of those currently cycling, .. to remove barriers ... to increase the modal share of cycling trips

<http://www.tfl.gov.uk/assets/downloads/businessandpartners/cycling-action-plan.pdf>

5.2 The Mayor's London Plan Policy 3C.21, directs what boroughs should put in their UDP's. The fourth bullet point refers to the LONDON CYCLING ACTION PLAN above. The LCC have challenged the first two bullet points.

UDP policies should:

- identify and implement high quality, direct, cycling routes, where possible segregated from motorised traffic, giving access to public transport nodes, town centres and key land uses

- ensure that routes are segregated from pedestrians as far as practicable, but are not isolated
- identify, complete and promote the relevant sections of the London cycle network plus, and other cycling routes
- **take account of measures identified in the TfL cycling action plan**
- encourage provision of sufficient, secure cycle parking facilities within developments

http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor/strategies/sds/london_plan/lon_plan_all.rtf

see APPENDIX 1 /3C.21

5.3 DfT's LOCAL TRANSPORT NOTE 1/04

The Department for Transport's Local Transport Note 1/04 provides a hierarchy of vulnerable users.

... The objective of such a hierarchy is to ensure that the needs of the most vulnerable road users are fully considered in all highway schemes, ...

<http://www.dft.gov.uk/consultations/archive/2004/ltnwc/ltn104policyplanninganddesig1691>

<http://www.dft.gov.uk/consultations/archive/2004/ltnwc/ltn104policyplanninganddesig1691?page=3#a1011>

5.4 SECURING THE EXPEDITIOUS MOVEMENT OF TRAFFIC

LBHF have a duty to follow the guidance of the Network Management Duty.

The Network Management Duty requires the LTA to consider the movement of all road users: pedestrians and cyclists, as well as motorised vehicles

<http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/roads/tpm/tma2004/trafficmanagementact2004netw4143>

6 London Cycle Network plus / [LCN+] link 73 / - Barriers to cycling

6.1 The roadways of SBG and HPR are on the East -West route through Shepherd's Bush. LCN+ Link 73 would travel along the Uxbridge Road from the junction of Askew and Old Oak Roads, past Shepherd's Bush Common to the Holland Park Roundabout.

They are also identified as barriers to cycling, something which should be addressed by 2010.

NOW is the time to address these issues.

http://www.tfl.gov.uk/assets/downloads/businessandpartners/LCN_High_Risk_Barriers_Report.pdf page 7

7 What data is the strategy based on?

7.1 There is a problem that the strategy appears to be based on a map that varies from reality. Between the W12 centre and Rockley Rd the pavement has been extended and trees planted. This happened several years ago, around 2002. The roadway is now narrowed significantly.

7.2 Similarly the Uxbridge road has recently been changed to a widened footway, a bus lane and two traffic lanes. The design drawing shows 4 lanes approaching the toucan crossing.

7.3 Either the road layout is old, from before these changes, or changes are planned in the present layout.

The same base map has been used in the Southern Interchange Planning Application.

TRANSPORT STATEMENT - APPENDIX B Swept Path Analyses

Drawing HFL-IA [95] 0070
page 4/11

<http://www.idoxwam.lbhf.gov.uk/WAM/doc/Planning%20Apps%20|%20Applicant%20Supporting%20Statement-346707.pdf?extension=.pdf&id=346707&location=VOLUME1&contentType=&pageCount=1>

7.4 If the traffic modelling was based on this map this might have consequences on the prediction of congestion.

8 Lane widths in the SI area / environmental issues

8.1 Lane widths are not given in strategy. But some information can be gleaned from the Planning Application for the SI.

8.2 Coming from the roundabout the lanes narrow from 3.25m to 3.0m as you approach the proposed SBG toucan

8.3 For the Uxbridge road - The designers response to the drawing showing 4 lanes on the Uxbridge rd rather than the 3 presently shown:

The proposed design will change the existing kerbline on the Uxbridge Rd - this has been through analysis and discussions with LBHF and TfL Walking and Cycling team.

8.4 The NMD refers to the movement of all road users. What matters is the traffic that gets through when the lights are green. The road is meant for movement.

We suggest that by the judicious use of lane widths cyclists can get through congested traffic, get a head start, and be out of the way when the rest of the traffic is moving.

If the traffic is so tight that cyclists cannot get through it also means that there is no give in the traffic that would allow emergency vehicles through.

Using the roadway to unnecessarily store queuing traffic that will not get through the next light will add to the pollution in the area, and produce an environment dominated by traffic

see APPENDIX 2 / LANE WIDTHS FROM THE SI PLANNING APPLICATION

9 LANE WIDTHS are particularly important for cyclists.

Where the lane is wider a cyclist may keep to the left of the lane and other traffic may overtake. When the lane approaches lights there may then be room for a lead-in to an ASL, or at least a cyclist will be able to get through, and get away at the lights.

When the traffic is congested it is preferable if the lanes are adequately wide so that cyclists can get through between the queuing lanes.

Converging lane widths or road space present an extra danger to cyclists.

Wide nearside lanes of 4.25m are recommended in some situations.

see APPENDIX 3 / WIDE NEARSIDE LANES

10 Cycling Advice

10.1 Where lanes are narrow cyclists are advised to ride assertively and occupy the lane.

see APPENDIX 4 / CYCLING ADVICE

11 Summary of how the strategy deals with on-road cyclists

11.1 HALCROW appears to favour improvements for cyclists on cycle-tracks leading to the Westfield development over consideration for cyclists on the roadway

For example, at Holland Park Roundabout there is no help for the majority of cyclists who stay on the roadway, whilst improvements are envisioned for the cycle-tracks.

Elsewhere the strategy describes the roadways around SBG, heavily used by cyclists, as not recommended or non-recommended for cyclists.

see APPENDIX 5 / NON-RECOMMENDED

12 Comparison of cyclist numbers on-road / off-road.

12.1 More cyclists prefer to use the roadway than the cycle tracks already provided. The official cycle counts for the SBG CRISP in 2005 showed very slight use of the cycletrack.

Present informal observations indicate that the cycle tracks are better used than in that count.

see APPENDIX 6 / CYCLE COUNTS

13 Difficulties introduced by Westfield

13.1 Difficulties for cyclists introduced into the road network include

a] Danger of layout of bus entrance / exit very close to roundabout, on sharp bend with road space narrowing.

b] No consideration appears to be given to the needs of cyclists in assigning road widths and lane widths on the roadway, a critical aspect of their safety.

c] Increase in congestion combined with the possibility of narrower lanes. This means cyclists might not be able to get through congested traffic. To encourage cycling this MUST NOT happen.

13.2 These problems are not dealt with adequately in the strategy

14 Westfield's commitment to cycling in the strategy

14.1 The strategy states

1.1.3

...

Westfield are committed to ensuring that there are convenient and connected cycle routes to and through the development linking into existing and new cycle lanes on the current road network, as well as off-road cycle-tracks. ...

14.2 The strategy needs to state explicitly that it is catering for off-road cyclists as complementary to, and not instead of, catering for on-road cycling.

14.3 The duty of care owed by the planners and Highway Authorities extends to the on-road users as well as to the off-road users.

15 Conclusion on legal agreement

15.1 The legal agreement envisioned cycling and environmental improvements in the Shepherds Bush area. To honour the legal agreement cycling improvements need to be provided for on-road cyclists.

This agreement was tied to the additional impacts on the local road network of the extra traffic expected.

16 Timing of cycling input

16.1 It would have been preferable if the needs of cyclists had been considered earlier and with higher priority.

Fortunately the authorities still have the opportunity to address our concerns at this stage.

17 Our Comments on the proposals in the strategy

17.1 We have carefully studied the proposals and have made comments on them, and some positive suggestions.

see APPENDIX 7 / COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

Contact details

John Griffiths [chair / co-ordinator hfcyclists - local branch of the London Cycling Campaign]
122c edith rd
London
W14 9AP
020 7371 1290 / 07789 095 748
john@truefeelings.com

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 / 3C.21

In the LCC response to the amendments to the London Plan consultation last year we made the following suggestions to revise the policy 3C.21

<<<<<<

Policy 3C.21 Improving conditions for cycling

DPD policies should:

. identify and implement high quality, direct, cycling routes, (XXXwhere possible segregated from motorised traffic,XXX) giving access to public transport nodes, town centres and key land uses where secure cycle parking should be ensured.

(XXX ensure that routes are segregated from pedestrians as far as practicable, but are not isolated XXX)

identify, complete and promote the relevant sections of the London Cycle Network Plus, and other cycling routes

ADD bullet

Cyclists should be exempted from point closures, turning restrictions and one-way orders and permitted to use bus gates unless there are overriding safety considerations that cannot be resolved

encourage ensure provision of sufficient, secure cycle parking facilities within developments, taking account of TfL's Cycle Parking Standards

encourage and improve safety for cycling and walking and reduce road danger, in particular by presuming that all London streets should have a 20mph limit

Reasons and Comment: We note the hierarchy of provision for cycle users referred to in the Department for Transport's Local Transport Note 1/04 and the TfL London Cycling Design Standards figure 4.2 (p. 63), which provides advice on mode segregation and motor traffic speed and volume. London Plan policies should reflect these documents, and the advice contained in them, rather than setting segregation as the default in all developments (London Plan pp. 149-150). We recommend that the London Plan should be fully updated to include adherence to the London Cycling Design Standards.

The Cycling Section of the plan would also be improved by providing guidance on permeability i.e., cycle user access to all streets.

>>>>>>>>>>

Charlie Lloyd
Cycling Development Officer
London Cycling Campaign

t: 020 7234 9310 ext 213

f: 020 7234 9319
e: charlie@lcc.org.uk
w: www.lcc.org.uk

London Cycling Campaign is a registered charitable company.
Company Reg No: 1766411 Charity Reg No: 1115789

APPENDIX 2 / LANE WIDTHS FROM THE SI PLANNING APPLICATION

On page 4 of 11 of the swept path analysis the drawing shows paths leaving the HPR just after the bus lane diverges as 3 at 3.25m. Where the bus lane joins the main carriageway in the approach to the toucan the lanes are given 3 at 3.0m and the adjacent off-side bus lane as 3.5m.

<http://www.idoxwam.lbhf.gov.uk/WAM/doc/Planning%20Apps%20|%20Applicant%20Supporting%20Statement-346707.pdf?extension=.pdf&id=346707&location=VOLUME1&contentType=&pageCount=1>

Appendix C. stage 1 road safety report

designers response at page 22 of 35

at page 27 of 35

A3.2.1

Problem Uxbridge road has recently been changed to a widened footway, a bus lane and two traffic lanes. The design drawing shows 4 lanes approaching the toucan crossing. This does not seem to correlate with the existing situation.

Recommendation

It may be proposed to revert Uxbridge road to 4 lanes but, with the widened footway, this looks unlikely. It may be necessary to adjust the design proposals accordingly.

Designers response

The proposed design will change the existing kerblines on Uxbridge Rd - this has been through analysis and discussions with LBHF and TfL Walking and Cycling team.

<http://www.idoxwam.lbhf.gov.uk/WAM/doc/Planning%20Apps%20|%20Applicant%20Supporting%20Statement-346709.pdf?extension=.pdf&id=346709&location=VOLUME1&contentType=&pageCount=1>

APPENDIX 3 / WIDE NEARSIDE LANES

Scottish Executive / Cycling by Design
5. NETWORK LINKS

5.20 Wide Nearside Lanes: A relatively simple and cost effective method of improving the safety aspects of a Shared Road Link is the provision of wide nearside lanes. These make use of the existing carriageway with the road markings adjusted to provide an increased nearside lane width. The use of wide nearside lanes has been endorsed by US, Australian and European authorities, and is recommended on all major routes, particularly primary distributor and district distributor roads, including single and dual carriageways. Actual cycle lanes are not marked on the carriageway.

5.21 Wide nearside lanes should be 4.25m wide to enable cyclists to have sufficient clearance from passing HGVs. Wider nearside lanes are not recommended as these may encourage other traffic to use the facility as two unmarked non-standard lanes.

<http://www.scottishexecutive.gov.uk/library2/cbd/cbd-06.asp>

APPENDIX 4 / CYCLING ADVICE

ADVICE FROM LCC ON ROAD POSITIONING / Cycling on the road

Road positioning

One of the key principles of safe cycling is to cycle in a prominent position on the road where you can be clearly seen.

Avoid cycling very close to the kerb or edge of the road, which reduces your room for manoeuvre and makes you more likely to hit drain covers and potholes. You should ride at least about a metre away from the edge of the road.

Proper road positioning can be summed up in the following points made by the cycling expert John Franklin:

"Increase your margin of safety ... by riding where you can obtain the best view, where you can best be seen by others and your movements predicted."

"Good road positioning is not about keeping you out of the path of other traffic as much as possible. Contrary to popular belief, this is not necessarily the best way to maximise safety."

John Franklin, Cyclecraft, The Stationery Office. 2004

In certain situations it may be safer to use all the space that your side of the road or lane allows. This may be necessary if there is not enough room for cars to overtake you without forcing you too close to parked cars or the side of the road. You should also take your entire lane when approaching a junction where it might be unsafe for a vehicle to be next to you or to come alongside you, (for instance where it might turn across the front of you - "cutting you up").

If you are stuck in traffic and vehicles are blocking your way forward you should not mount the kerb and ride on the pavement. Instead wait until you can safely cycle forward, or get off and walk your bike until you can cycle on the road again. You are still likely to be faster than other traffic.

<http://www.lcc.org.uk/index.asp?PageID=674>

APPENDIX 5 / NON-RECOMMENDED

THE STRATEGY DOES NOT HELP CYCLISTS WHO CHOOSE TO USE THE ROUNDABOUT, AND DESCRIBES THE ROADWAYS AROUND SBG as non recommended or not recommended.

For example, at Holland Park Roundabout there is no help for the majority of cyclists who stay on the roadway.

3.1.11 Holland Park Roundabout (South-East)

Many cyclists, however, use this roundabout, even although off-road cycle provision is provided around the edge of the roundabout.

4.1.13 Holland Park Roundabout (South-East)

No cycling proposals are anticipated to cater for cyclists on the heavily trafficked Holland Park Roundabout itself. Specific proposals (described under the following sections detailing the various arms of the roundabout) relate to improvements to the access points, and to the cycle track running around the roundabout itself.

Elsewhere the strategy describes the roadways around SBG, heavily used by cyclists, as not recommended or non-recommended for cyclists

3.1.1 Shepherd's Bush Green (South)

Shepherds Bush Green, is a one-way east-west London distributor road that is not a recommended cycle route according to TfL or LBHF.

4.1.5 Shepherd's Bush Common (South)

....

The cycle track through The Common aims to link existing, and indeed future cyclists, between its western and southern sides, whilst reducing the need to utilise the non-recommended (by TfL) cycle routes of Shepherd's Bush Green and Shepherd's Bush Road.

[ie TfL has non-recommended streets for cycling?]

4.1.6 Uxbridge Road (South)

....., an alternative to the busy Uxbridge Road, which is not a recommended route according to TfL and LBHF.

APPENDIX 6 / CYCLE COUNTS

Cycle flows from CRISP for SBG / 2005

The cycle flow data presented for this CRISP show that

Eastbound on roadway past central line station going to HPR 7am to 7pm - 393
[Westbound on roadway outside W12 centre - not given, but it would be a similar number]

On the cycle-track by W12 Centre, south side Shepherds Bush Green near roundabout - 7am to 7pm

eastbound 19
westbound 23

It appears that present usage of the cycle track is higher than that indicated here. It may be expected that the flows on this cycle track will increase when Westfield's WhiteCity opens.

APPENDIX 7 / COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

Comments and suggestions for Uxbridge rd

On the cycle lane on the Uxbridge rd it is often blocked by loading or parked cars. If traffic flows a problem could be made a bus lane, or a Red Route. Further along the Uxbridge road buses pulling out from bus stops cause difficulties for cyclists.

Most cyclists coming from the Uxbridge rd [west of the green] or Wood Lane would use the carriageway to get to HPR. If the roadway is congested and impenetrable then they are likely to switch to the new cycle track on the Common to by-pass the congestion.

This new cycle track is very helpful for cyclists going from east to west. However there is likely to be a high level of pedestrians straying onto this track. It also passes across the alighting and landing area of a pedestrian crossing.

If the roadway were to give a clear route for cyclists it would lower the number of cyclists using the green and the potential for pedestrian / cyclist conflict on this Cycle track.

Crossing the entrance / exit to the bus station - It is not clear whether or how the lanes will be marked. This may be dangerous to cyclists if the traffic spreads out and then has to converge again to get to the roundabout.

As cyclists approach the HPR on the Uxbridge rd the lanes are narrow. Buses are entering the flow very close to the roundabout. It is on an abrupt curve. There is also a funnelling effect of converging roadsapce. It is going uphill.

There is increased danger of squeezing as you pass through this area. It is reported to me that this area is very threatening. [Amanda Carter. John Mickleburgh, Pat Tookey].

Comments and suggestions for HPR

At the entrance to HPR from the Uxbridge rd - cyclists already move to the brow of the incline when waiting at the lights, avoiding the nearside lane. I have suggested moving the stop line forward to the brow of the incline. But perhaps moving it forward may be counter to cyclists' safety. Moving the stop line forward will also move cars and motor bikes closer to the roundabout. As it stands cyclists are looking after their own safety and know what to do. They can use the light on the central island rather than the Primary light which would be behind them.

On the roundabout - place cycle signs on the roadway on the nearside lane at exit to Holland Park Avenue. At the moment there exists a below standard cycle lane which peters out on the corner. Cyclists should hold lane when there is a danger of being squeezed.

I have not observed the roundabout when it is congested. Wide nearside lanes or reservoirs at lights at the north and south splitters [ie splitters at main north and south routes] may help if there is a difficulty getting through.

The proposal for an at-grade toucan crossing of the West Cross Route near the gyratory is positive. Shared-use connection with Royal Crescent seems sensible. However those planters on the pavement should probably either be reduced in width or removed, also the one adjacent to the cycle track on the south east corner.

For cyclists from Holland Park Avenue the obvious way to get to the Westfield Centre would be by crossing Holland Park Avenue and using the Toucan across the West Cross route. That crossing is also used by cyclists coming on the cycle track from the south and heading east or north east. [Suggestions in rbkc from Philip Loy]

Comments and suggestions for Shepherd's Bush Green (South)

COMING OFF THE HOLLAND PARK ROUNDABOUT TOWARDS SBG

Lane widths are not given with the strategy. However something can be gleaned from SI planning documents. These indicate that as you approach the toucan from the HPR the road narrows from 3 x 3.25m lanes to 3 x 3.0m lanes, with buses in the nearside lane. There is a slight curve on the road.

Not much room for a bus [2.55m wide] to squeeze by a cyclist.

[On page 4 of 11 of the Swept Path Analysis document supporting the SI application the drawing shows paths leaving the HPR just after the bus lane diverges as 3 at 3.25m. Where the bus lane joins the main carriageway in the approach to the toucan the lanes are given 3 at 3.0m and the adjacent off-side bus lane as 3.5m. [346704 file]]

CYCLE-TRACK AT W12 CENTRE

4.1.1 Shepherd's Bush Green (South)

It is recommended that the cycle stands be removed and relocated to allow the existing cycle track to be EXTENDED to the site of the new toucan crossing.

Move the cycle stands to where? There is no other appropriate space for cycle stands for visitors to this W12 centre. If the barriers are to be removed there will be even greater pressure on cycle parking in this area.

If cyclist usage is not predicted to be high, ie to be of the order of 1 cyclist per light change in each direction or less, it would make more sense to have the pavement space beyond the end of the present cycle track as shared use. This is particularly so if the toucan is to be shared use rather than segregated.

This would leave more space available on the pavement for pedestrians, when a cyclist is not present. Cyclists tend to be assertive when pedestrians step onto their space.

TOUCAN

4.1.1

To further reduce user conflict at the crossing, it is recommended that a 3m (desirable minimum) section of coloured surfacing (with cycle symbols) be provided on the eastern edge of the new toucan crossing (see Figure 4). This arrangement is similar to that found at the crossing and entry point to Hyde Park, at Hyde Park Corner.

At Hyde Park corner, the best example is perhaps the one going from the main island with the Wellington Arch to Green Park. This works well as there is a high flow of cyclists and a low flow of pedestrians. The directions from which cyclists and pedestrians approach is in line with their respective spaces on the crossing.

At the Knightsbridge crossing there are barriers separating pedestrians and cyclists on the island partway through the crossing.

At the SBG toucan there will be a large flow of pedestrians coming out of the SI and Westfield's Whitecity itself and approaching the crossing from the east. With low cyclist numbers using the crossing, its approach on the pavement may well be blocked by pedestrians. At the Goldhawk rd junction with Shepherds Bush rd, pedestrians tend to use the cycle crossing when coming from the common, as it is the shortest route.

So by the Central Line station, shared use might be the preferred option on the crossing. This would also make the space available to pedestrians when there are no cyclists around.

The space available behind the crossing at the Central line station end seems limited.

Some cyclists coming across the crossing from north to south would be wanting to cross the pedestrian flow to join the westbound traffic flow. They would not want to go back to the ASL, when they could cross the pedestrian flow and get away before all the traffic, as the strategy suggests. Under shared use this would be allowed.

There is also the mystery cycle route shown on the pavement of the Uxbridge rd going from the toucan up to a pedestrian crossing to the common. This is shown on the drawing for the SI planning application, appendix A, DRAWING 68 on page 4.

However observation of this pavement shows it is highly used by pedestrians, and space is very limited.

ADVANCED STOP LINES [ASLS] AT THE TOUCAN

4.1.1

Scope exists to better accommodate cycle movements coming across the carriageway to access The Common, especially if coming from the inside lane (need to cross four lanes). The westbound ASL at the aforementioned toucan aims to have a lead in stub, providing for access to the outer lane. This encourages cyclists to come away from following the kerblines, particularly if they are right-turning into The Common, ahead, thus allowing them to take a better riding position within the carriageway.

With a 3.0m nearside lane, is there any room for a lead-in stub? You need lead-ins for ASL's. The London Cycling Design Standards gives advice at LCDS 5.3.17 / 5.3.18 and fig 5.2.

It is a little dependent on circumstances, but 3.8m appears to be minimum lane width that would support a lead-in. If there are likely to be HGVs around, then the minimum lane width for allowing a lead in would be over 4m.

ASL's fine when you arrive on a red light, or there is space between lanes to get to the front. ALSO need to consider cyclists on carriageway and arriving on green light. They need to stop for crossing without blocking carriageway.

APPROACH TO ROCKLEY ROAD / GETTING ON TO THE COMMON

This is considered one of the most difficult parts of the road network for cyclists, and should be addressed

For crossing to the right hand lane, what would be useful is a place where cyclists can pull in on the left after the Toucan crossing when they arrive on a green light. They can then move across when the traffic has stopped flowing and get moving a long time ahead of general traffic. Depends on traffic coming through cut-through.

Maybe a bit hairy being in the right hand lane, probably 3.0m to 3.2m wide with a bus 2.55m wide bearing down on you. And cars moving across from the left to fill the lane.

Problem of hinterland of pedestrian crossing which is where experienced cyclists come off the road. Very limited space in behind this area. Problem of pedestrians waiting to cross blocking the landing area. Suggest taking space from dog run.

Also a very sharp turn onto the cycle route beyond the pedestrian crossing.

At its junction with Rockley Road, the ASLs should have more than one lead-in lane (or lead-in point), to reduce cyclists currently crossing more than one lane of traffic, to access The Common.

Not sure of lane widths here, and if lead-ins would be allowed under LCDS guidance.

ASL's ONLY work if you arrive on red, and can get through to the front.

I understand LBHF is considering a refuge to help westbound cyclists get onto the COMMON. At the CRISP of the Uxbridge rd on 3 August 2007 I understood that a safety audit had already been completed on plans for this refuge. LCN+ meanwhile have different suggestions for this crossing which would reduce the dead space between the pedestrian and the cycle crossing. At the moment the signals allow slow moving motorists who have passed the primary signal on green to cross the cycle crossing after the lights have changed to red.

NEW ROUTE TO AVOID THIS DIFFICULT AREA

Cyclists could go from the Toucan to the apex of Common if there was a route across the cut through, and a cycle route on the Common connecting to other cycle routes on the common.

Comments and suggestions for Wood lane

I see a problem in northbound cyclists on Wood Lane obtaining access to cycle parking there. If they stop on the carriageway they will be a danger to other cyclists. Before crossings there could be a space where cyclists can pull in off the carriageway. This problem needs to be addressed in some way.

Cycle Access to the Southern Interchange.

The cycle parking has been put in an inconvenient place for cyclists. The obvious place to put it is at the junction of Eat Street and the Eastern Access rd.

This could be accessed from the road at the mini-roundabout, using the suggestion of a central cycle lane as ventured by Chris Bainbridge from a suggestion by Peter Monk. Or the cycle stands could be accessed via the pedestrian route with a preferred route for cyclists and marked as shared use, pedestrian priority.