



Cycle Superhighway Route 11 between Swiss Cottage and the West End

Response to Issues Raised
December 2016

Contents

Executive summary	4
Next steps	4
Summary of changes	6
Responses to issues raised: overall scheme	8
Concerns about the consultation.....	8
Traffic modelling information	13
Impact on general motor traffic	17
Impact on bus passengers	23
Comment on cycling strategy.....	26
Environmental impact	33
Impact on cycling	34
Impact on pedestrians.....	39
Impact on equality.....	41
Impact on parking	42
Impact on freight, deliveries and servicing	43
Impact on taxis and private hire	44
Impact on road safety	44
Section 1: Swiss Cottage	46
Impact on motor traffic	46
Impact on cycling	49
Impact on pedestrians.....	53
Impact on people with disabilities.....	55
Impact on buses.....	55
Impact on taxis.....	56
Impact on parking and loading.....	56
Environmental impact	57
Impact on business	58
Section 2: Avenue Road (north) & Section 3: Avenue Road (south)	59
Impact on cycling	59
Impact on motor traffic	62
Impact on bus passengers	63

Impact on parking	64
Impact on environment	64
Impact on taxis.....	64
Impact on road safety	65
Section 4: The Regent’s Park.....	66
Section 5: Park Crescent and Portland Place & Section 6: Portland Place	67
Impact on cycling	67
Impact on motor traffic	69
Impact on parking	69
Impact on pedestrians.....	70
Impact on bus passengers	70
Appendix A: Updated traffic modelling information.....	72
Appendix B: Improving road user behaviour	75

Executive summary

Between 8 February and 20 March 2016, we consulted on detailed proposals for Cycle Superhighway 11 (CS11) between Swiss Cottage and the West End.

In August 2016, we published our factual Consultation Report, which described the consultation process and highlighted the issues most frequently raised during the consultation.

We received 6,270 responses to the consultation, of which 60 per cent supported (53%) or partially supported (7%) our proposals. 37 per cent did not support the proposals, while 3 per cent said they were not sure or did not give an opinion.

Following consultation, we held a series of meetings with stakeholders including local boroughs, The Royal Parks, campaign groups (both in favour of and against the scheme) and residents' associations. We also attended meetings with MPs and local councillors. These meetings were an opportunity to discuss some of the issues that were raised during consultation and share ideas about how we might be able to respond to concerns.

This document explains the decisions we have taken about the future of the scheme after having considered the responses to consultation, and also explains our responses to the issues most frequently raised during the consultation.

Next steps

Having considered all responses to consultation, we intend to proceed to the next stage, namely full engineering design ('detailed design'), of the majority of the proposals outlined in the CS11 consultation. However, we will be doing further work on the proposals for The Regent's Park before deciding on a way forward for this section of the route.

Swiss Cottage and Avenue Road

We have made a number of changes to the proposals in response to issues raised during consultation. There was particular concern among local residents that there would be an increase in the amount of motor traffic in some minor roads as a result of the CS11 proposals. We have reviewed the designs and we now plan to allow motor vehicles to make two turns that we had originally proposed to ban (details are set out below).

Traffic modelling indicates that allowing these turns will significantly reduce the amount of traffic reassigning into nearby minor roads. It will also improve access for local people who want to reach destinations to the west of Swiss Cottage. However, with transformational schemes such as this, changes to traffic patterns are inevitable and some reassignment will still occur.

Allowing these turns will change the journey time impacts of the scheme, and journey times for buses and motor traffic travelling east on Hilgrove Road are now predicted to increase. Because of this, we will be looking into whether it is possible to design the junction so that the right turn from Finchley Road into Hilgrove Road could be banned on a part-time basis. Vehicles would be able to make this turn most of the time, but the turn could be banned at the busiest times. This dynamic use of road space would help us to strike the best balance between the needs of different road users.

We have carried out traffic modelling to understand the impact that introducing the scheme and allowing these turns would have. We have looked at the impacts that the revised proposals would have on journey times and traffic movements in the wider area around the scheme. Our assumption in this modelling is that both turns would be allowed at all times. If we decide to change the design of the junction between Finchley Road and Hilgrove Road / Adelaide Road we will publish updated traffic modelling on our website.

We have made a number of other smaller changes to the proposals in response to feedback. These are set out below, with traffic modelling information provided in [Appendix A](#).

Subject to the formal Traffic Order process, our internal approvals and governance processes and those of the local highway authorities, we aim to start construction at Swiss Cottage in autumn 2017 with completion planned for 2018.

The Regent's Park

The objective for this element of the route has been to make The Regent's Park a safer and more attractive environment better in keeping with its original design, in particular improving the safety and comfort of pedestrians and cyclists. To achieve this the proposals for CS11 have sought to:

- Reduce the volume of through traffic in the park during the busiest periods
- Ensure that traffic in the park travels at a speed which is appropriate for the park environment
- Better provide for the safety of both cyclists and pedestrians

There have been many views and suggestions as to the best way to achieve this set of objectives and further discussions will continue between The Royal Parks, the Crown Estate Paving Commission and ourselves to establish how improvements could be made for both pedestrians and cyclists using the Outer Circle. While the limited closure of some of the park gates at the busiest times of the day still remains still remains our default option, any closures would not be put in place until Summer 2018 at the earliest when work on Swiss Cottage will be largely complete and therefore time will be taken to explore any alternative measures that may deliver

these objectives equally well. To allow time for discussion and exploration of alternative measures, we will announce a way forward for this aspect of the CS11 scheme by summer 2017.

In the meantime, a reduction in vehicle speed within The Regent's Park will be an important feature of any set of future measures, and work to commence exploration of how a 20mph speed limit may be achieved for the whole of the park will commence with immediate effect.

Portland Place

We consulted on two options for Portland Place. Having considered the consultation responses, we will be taking forward Option B – segregated cycle lanes on Portland Place. We will now carry out detailed traffic modelling on this option and the design will be reviewed in the light of the outcomes of this modelling.

Summary of changes

Section 1: Swiss Cottage

- We proposed banning the existing left turn from Finchley Road into College Crescent for all traffic. In the revised scheme, this turn will be banned for general traffic, and allowed for buses and cycles only
- We proposed banning the right turn from College Crescent into Finchley Road (which is not currently possible as a direct movement due to the gyratory system). In the revised scheme, this movement will be allowed for all traffic
- The straight-across pedestrian crossing on College Crescent will run in two stages with pedestrians waiting on an island in the middle of the road, in order to minimise the extra delay to general traffic and buses caused by allowing the two turns described above
- The right turn from Finchley Road southbound into Hilgrove Road, (which is not currently possible as a direct movement due to the gyratory system) will be allowed for all traffic. We will be looking into whether it is possible to design the junction so that the right turn from Finchley Road into Hilgrove Road could be banned on a part-time basis, to manage traffic flows around Swiss Cottage and minimise journey time delays
- We have changed the junction of St John's Wood Park and Adelaide Road to enable northbound cyclists to join CS11 more easily and continue north on Avenue Road. The changes will also preserve a tree at this location
- The segregated cycle lane on Avenue Road through Swiss Cottage will be stepped rather than kerb-segregated, meaning that the cycle lane would effectively be wider

- Due to concerns about abnormal loads using Finchley Road, we are moving the taxi bay proposed on the east side of Finchley Road outside Swiss Cottage
- We will work with businesses on Finchley Road on a study to understand their loading requirements and we will review the proposed hours of operation of loading bays on Finchley Road and at Swiss Cottage following this process

Section 2: Avenue Road (north)

We will progress the proposals for the section of Avenue Road between Adelaide Road and Norfolk Road as set out in the consultation materials.

Section 3: Avenue Road (south)

We will progress the proposals for the section of Avenue Road between Norfolk Road and Prince Albert Road as set out in the consultation materials.

Section 4: The Regent's Park

- The limited closure of some of the park gates at the busiest times of the day still remains our default option, but we will carry out further work to see if there are alternative options which better meet the objectives to protect cyclists and pedestrians from the speed and volume of motor traffic currently using the Outer Circle at all times of the day
- In the meantime we will work with The Royal Parks to explore the viability of a 20mph speed limit in The Regent's Park. This could be supported by signage including illuminated vehicle-activated signs to improve compliance.

Sections 5 and 6: Park Crescent and Portland Place

- We will undertake detailed traffic modelling on Option B, for segregated cycle lanes and aim to implement the scheme as proposed subject to the outcome of this modelling and subject to the development of Westminster City Council's plans to provide contra-flow cycle facilities on New Cavendish Street.
- We will investigate the possibility of extending the proposed segregation to Park Crescent

Responses to issues raised: overall scheme

We have worked closely with key stakeholders including the London Borough of Camden, Westminster City Council and The Royal Parks on our responses to the issues raised during the public consultation.

Concerns about the consultation

Consultation publicity

Some respondents expressed concern that we had not publicised the consultation widely enough.

We are satisfied that the consultation was well publicised. The channels we used to publicise the consultation are detailed in Chapter 2 of our [Consultation Report](#), and included leaflets, emails, social media, drop-in public events, public meetings, and press coverage. We also visited businesses and organisations in the Swiss Cottage area, and handed out leaflets about the scheme in Swiss Cottage and The Regent's Park in the lead-up to the public events. The 6,270 responses that we received compares favourably with consultations on other similarly sized infrastructure projects, and we are satisfied the responses provided us with a strong understanding of the issues around the scheme.

Delivery of notification leaflets

Some respondents expressed concern that we did not deliver leaflets in the local area as claimed.

We delivered 50,000 consultation notification leaflets to an area up to 600 metres from the proposals. For more information about this see Chapter 2 of our [Consultation Report](#). We used a trusted delivery provider, to carry out this service. Our distributor uses GPS trackers to monitor movements of its agents, and provides detailed delivery reports. We accept there are limits to the accuracy of the GPS tracks, which rely on mobile phone technology. However, having reviewed the delivery reports for CS11, and analysed GPS tracks where queries around delivery to specific roads or areas arose, we are satisfied the leaflets were delivered as intended.

A sample GPS track is shown below for deliveries in and around Fellows Road, NW3. The blue lines show the movements of delivery agents, either on foot or in a motor vehicle. We are satisfied they visited all roads and properties as intended.



Leaflet delivery area

Some respondents expressed concern that we did not deliver notification leaflets to a wide enough area, so that some people who would be affected by the proposals were not notified about the consultation.

We are satisfied that we delivered leaflets to an appropriate area when considering the need to balance providing information to those living near the proposals with the reasonable expenditure of public funds. Leaflets were only one of many successful channels used to publicise the consultation, and many people responded who lived outside of the leafleted area. The complete leaflet distribution area is shown in our Consultation Report.

Consulting too soon

Some respondents expressed concern that the consultation took place too soon, before complete plans for CS11, including the section between Swiss Cottage and Brent Cross, had been developed.

At present, we do not have any proposals for the CS11 route north from Swiss Cottage towards Brent Cross. We are satisfied that the CS11 route that we consulted on from Swiss Cottage to Portland Place can operate successfully irrespective of whether there is any route extension north of Swiss Cottage. For this reason, we decided to consult on CS11 in its current form.

Consulting too late

Some respondents expressed concern that the consultation took place too late, and that the proposals were too far advanced to be changed.

We are satisfied that the consultation took place at a time when the proposals were still at a formative stage, and this is reflected by the fact that revisions have been possible in response to feedback received during consultation (for details of these revisions, see the [Summary of changes](#)).

Length of consultation

Some respondents expressed concern that the consultation period was too short.

The CS11 public consultation was open for a period of six weeks. During this time, we received 6,270 responses, with many respondents from the local area and across Greater London. Of those 6,270 responses, 110 were submitted by stakeholders. We are satisfied that sufficient time was provided for individuals and stakeholders to consider the proposals and formulate their responses. We consider the consultation to have been very successful in highlighting views on the scheme that are relevant to our decision-making process.

Levels of support

Some respondents expressed concern that figures published in our [Consultation Report](#) showed a majority in favour of the scheme when, in their view, a majority of people were opposed to the scheme.

We accurately reported the levels of support of those who responded to our consultation, and this showed a majority in favour of the scheme. We reported these figures in our Consultation Report in the Executive Summary and in detail in Chapter 4. A consultation is not a public vote. Its purpose is to help us make the best-informed decisions in a fair way by highlighting issues and views relevant to the scheme that might not have been revealed during our feasibility investigations. We are satisfied that the consultation successfully raised the relevant issues and opinions around CS11, and allowed us to make the best-informed decision as to how to proceed with the scheme.

Petition signatures

Some respondents expressed concern that we had not counted petition signatures as consultation responses when we published figures showing levels of support for the scheme in our [Consultation Report](#).

All our consultations follow a widely accepted best-practice approach to receiving and reporting petitions. Our Consultation Team has been accredited as a Centre of Excellence by The Consultation Institute the UK's independent body promoting best-practice consultation, and we are satisfied that we treated all petitions properly and

fairly in accordance with our guidelines and best practice. We summarised all CS11 petitions fairly and accurately in our report. We also included the issues arising from the petition comments in our Consultation Report's detailed analysis section. Every petition comment was read and analysed using the same methodology that we used to analyse consultation comments. Petitions were given substantial prominence in our Consultation Report, being highlighted in the Executive Summary, detailed in their own section, and with the comments summarised and analysed at length in Appendix B.

We do not aggregate petition signatures with consultation responses because petition signatures have not been submitted through one of our recognised channels of response. Petition signatures and comments are submitted in response to information and arguments put forward by a petitioner whereas consultation responses are, to our knowledge, submitted in response to consultation materials.

Weighting local responses

Some respondents said we should have weighted local responses more highly than other responses when we reported levels of support for the consultation.

We put considerable effort into publicising our consultation in the area near the scheme, because we recognise that local people possess highly useful local knowledge and are a vital part of the consultation process. However, those from outside the area can also contribute valuable information. Consultation is intended to highlight issues relevant to the scheme, which might not have been revealed during our feasibility investigations. Anyone can highlight a valid concern, suggestion or opinion about a scheme, not just people who live near a scheme.

Not enough information

Some respondents said that not enough information was provided in our consultation materials to make a properly informed response to the proposals.

We are satisfied that we provided more than adequate information to allow consultees to understand and form an opinion about the scheme. We published approximately 5,000 words and 20 maps and images on our website describing the proposals being consulted on. We also provided contact details on the website to allow people to ask either general questions about the scheme or specific questions about traffic-modelling.

Too much information

Some respondents said that too much information was provided and that the volume of materials was confusing.

We recognise that a significant amount of information was presented in our consultation materials, including approximately 5,000 words of explanatory information and 20 maps and images describing the proposed changes. Before we

launch any consultation, we carefully consider what information to publish, aiming to find the best balance between transparency and not providing a confusing amount of information. In this instance, we took the decision to publish a significant quantity, with this information broken down by area and subject matter. We made some information available on request. We continue to look at how we can best present our proposals about major road schemes.

Misunderstanding the proposals

Feedback received during consultation and some of the questions we were asked showed that some respondents were confused about some parts of our CS11 proposals.

The eastern side of the Swiss Cottage 'triangle' is part of Avenue Road, which continues south of Adelaide Road as far as Prince Albert Road and North Gate into The Regent's Park. Some people incorrectly believed that we intended to close all Avenue Road to general traffic – i.e., the section south of Adelaide Road as well as the section to the north. In fact, we had no plans to close Avenue Road south of Adelaide Road to general traffic. In addition, some people also misunderstood the fact that we said we would continue to route buses along the Swiss Cottage section of Avenue Road, believing we intended to introduce new bus services along the southern section of Avenue Road, south of Adelaide Road.

Similarly, while we actually proposed access restrictions at four of the eight gates in and out of The Regent's Park during the busiest times of day only, with all access restrictions lifted between 11am and 3pm, some people believed that we were planning to ban motor traffic from the Outer Circle entirely.

During any consultation, we frequently review materials in light of the feedback we have received to ensure we are communicating effectively. We are satisfied that our website and leaflet made it clear, using appropriate text and maps, which section of Avenue Road would be closed to general traffic and which park gates would be subject to access restrictions at what times.

Wherever possible, we corrected any erroneous views of the scheme, and encouraged respondents to give feedback on the correct proposals. Where we received feedback on things that we had not proposed, these were reported in Appendix A of our [Consultation Report](#).

Traffic modelling information

We carried out detailed traffic modelling in order to understand the expected impact of our proposals on road users, including general traffic, bus passengers and pedestrians. A text summary of the modelling work was included in the public consultation materials, along with tables of predicted journey times and longer text descriptions of the predicted impacts. The modelling information is still available at on our consultation website.

Validity of traffic-modelling

Some respondents questioned the validity of our traffic modelling predictions, which we presented as part of the information explaining our CS11 proposals. Our ability to accurately predict the impacts of CS11 on the road network was questioned, and it was suggested we had given a misleading impression of the likely impacts of the proposed interventions.

We possess a high level of technical modelling expertise, which has been developed since the 1970s. We have been continuously responsible for the operation of London's traffic control systems, the design, audit and implementation of traffic schemes and traffic signal timing reviews. These activities provide an excellent grounding for developing traffic modelling skills. We follow, as standard, industry guidelines set out in the Department for Transport Appraisal Guidance (TAG).

It is important to recognise that traffic models are predictive tools to better help plan, design and operate transport networks. Models are designed to be simplifications of the real world, at a particular moment in time, averaged over an observed period, and are used to evaluate the impacts, both positive and negative, of future network interventions. Traffic models present an offline environment in which numerous design solutions can be tested and appraised with the aim of achieving the optimum balance of benefits and value for money.

Despite the sophistication of our traffic models, all traffic modelling is only ever indicative; it is intended to give an idea of where the impacts of changes in journey choice are most likely to be felt. It assumes that drivers have perfect knowledge of the network and will always choose the quickest route available.

Our models aim to present a worst-case scenario, predicting journey times at peak times. These journey times may be mitigated by factors including motorists changing their journeys from peak times to other times; using different modes such as public transport, walking or cycling; and not carrying out journeys at all.

We actively monitor and manage traffic conditions on the roads following delivery of major schemes, and for CS11 we will aim to mitigate and manage any traffic impacts following implementation. We are investing in advanced traffic signal technology to allow us to better manage traffic depending on differing conditions at any given time, and we are working to improve road user information so people can make informed journey choices before they travel.

We are satisfied that our traffic modelling allowed people to understand the potential impacts of the proposed interventions on traffic flows, within the technical limitations of the discipline as a whole.

Modelling exact CS11 journeys

Some respondents expressed concern that journeys along the A41 Finchley Road and Marylebone Road were modelled instead of along the CS11 route.

For the CS11 proposals, traffic modelling was carried out in two parts. One part looked at the impacts of the proposals on the main north-south route through the scheme, focusing on the A41 from Hendon Way to Baker Street. The second part assessed the impact of the proposals on traffic travelling eastbound or westbound along Marylebone Road, at the southern end of the proposed scheme. These two routes were selected for modelling because they represent the most significant movement through those areas for general traffic and buses, and it was considered that this is where the most significant and illustrative traffic impacts of the scheme are likely to arise.

Detailed traffic modelling of those routes was carried out, providing us with a detailed assessment of the routes that represent the majority of journeys through the corridor area. The results were published as part of the consultation materials, identifying the modelled routes and the likely journey time impacts on traffic, buses, cyclists and pedestrians; the expected future situation with the scheme in place; and the difference between the two. Accordingly, the main and most significant traffic and illustrative traffic impacts of the proposed scheme were published for consultation.

Transparency of information

Some respondents expressed concern that we were not transparent with our traffic modelling information.

During consultation, we invited anyone to contact our Traffic Modelling team if they had further questions about the modelling provided on our website or if they wanted more technical data and information underpinning our traffic models. Our approach was to share as much data as was technically feasible, in line with our and the Mayor of London's broader commitments to Open Data and transparency.

Much of the information requested required accompanying explanation, which was achieved through individual meetings and explanatory reports. At the end of this process, a large number of separate items of data and information had been issued to those who made specific requests.

2012 data in traffic models

Some respondents expressed concern that our traffic models used data from 2012 to make predictions about future traffic patterns.

Traffic models are predictive tools that we use to help plan, design and operate the transport networks. Models are designed as simplifications of the real world at a particular moment in time, averaged over an observed period, and are used to evaluate the impacts, both negative and positive, of future network interventions. The observations are averages taken from link traffic surveys in a neutral month, free of school and bank holidays, for a minimum of two weeks. This data is used to calibrate the major traffic movements across the modelled area.

Given the scale of the task to calibrate strategic models for an area as large as Greater London, the base year data is only refreshed periodically, which is why the 2012 base year is used in the CS11 assessment. We use the industry-standard methodology¹ to calibrate and update our strategic model in preparation for assessing a new scheme or proposals.

Once the base (existing) model has been created, a new model is then developed to represent the state of the network in a future year, which for CS11 was 2016. At the time of the model's development, detailed information was available on the Baker Street Two-way scheme and the West End Project (these being the pertinent schemes in the vicinity of CS11). This formed the new model upon which the CS11 proposals were tested and compared back to. A comparison between the new 2016 model and a with-CS11 version of that 2016 model allowed the potential impacts of the CS11 interventions to be seen in isolation.

HS2 (High Speed 2)

Some respondents expressed concern that we had not adequately modelled the impact of construction traffic for HS2 (High Speed 2), the planned high-speed railway linking London to other UK cities.

At the time when we consulted on the proposals for CS11 in February 2016, we were not in a position to provide modelling outputs that included the impact of HS2 construction work. HS2 has provided high-level information about what its works involve, some of which has been shared with the public by HS2. However, the information shared so far is neither finalised nor sufficiently detailed enough to be used in our traffic modelling, which relies on the input of accurate data in order to produce reliable outputs.

In order for HS2 to carry out a detailed assessment of the cumulative impact of CS11 construction and HS2 works, further information about the HS2 works is needed. This detailed information is not expected to be available until 2017 when HS2 has appointed contractors, developed detailed designs and begun its planning approval process, which involves engagement with highway authorities, pre-application meetings, plan notification and consultation with traffic liaison groups.

As soon as the required information becomes available, we will work closely with HS2 to ensure the potential impacts of both CS11 and HS2 are understood. We will

¹ 'TAG UNIT M3.1 Highway Assignment Modelling', Department for Transport, January 2014

expect HS2 to include CS11 in all their modelling assessments as a committed scheme and we and HS2 will work together to minimise traffic disruption associated with HS2 works.

If HS2 gains Royal Assent to proceed early in 2017, as is expected, HS2 will have the power to carry out whatever works are required to achieve its objectives. However, as a Government agency, HS2 will be expected to work closely with us and to go through the usual permitting and approval procedures we have in place to manage complex works on London's roads. This has been our experience with other similar infrastructure projects that have obtained Royal Assent, such as Thames Tideway and Crossrail.

Baker Street two-way

Some respondents expressed concern that we had not adequately accounted for the impact on CS11 in conjunction with the two-way Baker Street proposals.

Our traffic models have taken into account the proposals for Baker Street, and we have assessed CS11 in the context of Baker Street to ensure we have an understanding of the cumulative impacts of both schemes. Our modelling shows that CS11 should not have an undue impact on journeys through Baker Street, and we are confident that both proposals can be implemented together successfully. We will continue to work with Westminster City Council to ensure that construction is co-ordinated to minimise impacts on local people and road users.

100 Avenue Road

Some respondents expressed concern that the CS11 proposals have not adequately taken into consideration the 100 Avenue Road proposals.

During the design of CS11 and when the consultation launched on 20 March 2016, the 100 Avenue Road development did not have agreed planning permission in place. As such, we did not include this proposed development on our consultation maps or visualisations.

Now that the 100 Avenue Road development has planning permission, we will work with the developer to ensure any disruption arising from construction of the development is coordinated with other works in the area and minimised. The development is intended to be car-free, with no basement parking or parking permits provided for residents except for a small number of bays for disabled users. This is in line with the London Borough of Camden's planning policy and means the new development is not expected to generate a significant number of extra vehicle trips once construction is complete. Servicing and loading for the development would take place from the rear of the site via Eton Avenue, so access from Avenue Road would not be required.

Property developments

Some respondents expressed concern that we have failed to take into account either construction traffic or additional general traffic that is likely to result from other property developments in the area, such as the St John's Wood Barracks.

We are satisfied that our traffic modelling has taken into account, wherever possible, proposed changes to the road network such as those listed above. We do not believe that these new developments will generate significant extra trips in the context of the CS11 scheme, either in their final form or during the construction period.

Impact on general motor traffic

The impact of the proposals on general traffic was a concern for many people who responded to the consultation. As a result of this feedback, we have made several changes to the proposals, including allowing some turns that were originally proposed to be banned.

We have modelled these changes at both a local and a strategic level, and updated modelling results can be found in [Appendix A](#). We will not be making a decision about whether we will proceed with the proposal to restrict access at four of the eight gates into The Regent's Park during the busiest part of the day until summer 2017. In the meantime we will be exploring other options for this section of the route. The traffic modelling assumes the access restrictions are in place and so represents a 'worst-case' scenario in terms of impact on motor traffic.

More detail about the issues that are addressed by the changes to the proposals can be found below.

Traffic reassignment to residential roads

In our consultation materials, we acknowledged there would be traffic impacts on other roads not directly on the route, with some roads likely to see an increase in traffic because of our proposals, while other roads would more likely experience a reduction in motor traffic volumes.

Some respondents expressed concern about motor traffic being displaced to other roads not directly on the CS11 route alignment. Areas of particular concern were Hampstead, St. John's Wood, residential streets to the west and south of Swiss Cottage and the area around the Royal Free Hospital. There were concerns from residents that these roads would be negatively impacted by increased traffic, with associated problems of congestion and pollution.

When we consulted on the scheme, we proposed to ban the right turn from College Crescent into Finchley Road and the right turn from Finchley Road into Hilgrove Road for all vehicles. We have changed the proposals to allow all vehicles to make both of these turns.

Allowing vehicles to make these turns will reduce inconvenience for people making local journeys as they will be able to take a more direct route. This will in turn reduce the amount of traffic which is likely to reassign from the A41 into nearby minor roads. However, allowing these turns does mean some journey times are predicted to increase for buses and general traffic travelling east on Hilgrove Road during the busiest periods. For this reason we will be looking into whether it is possible to design the junction so that the right turn from Finchley Road into Hilgrove Road could be banned on a part-time basis. Vehicles would be able to make this turn most of the time, but the turn could be banned at the busiest times. By using the road space dynamically we aim to strike the best balance between the needs of different road users.

We have carried out traffic modelling to understand the impact that introducing the scheme and allowing these turns would have. We have looked at the impacts that the revised proposals would have on journey times and traffic movements in the wider area around the scheme. This modelling information can be found in [Appendix A](#). Our assumption in this modelling is that both turns would be allowed at all times. If we decide to change the design of the junction between Finchley Road and Hilgrove Road / Adelaide Road this we will publish updated traffic modelling.

Discussions will continue between ourselves, The Royal Parks and the Crown Estate Paving Commission to establish how both cyclists and pedestrians can be protected from both the speed and volume of motor traffic using the Outer Circle. While the limited closure of some of the park gates at the busiest times of the day still remains a likely part of the solution, time will be taken to explore any alternative measures that may deliver these objectives equally well.

Following delivery of the scheme, we will actively monitor and manage traffic conditions on the roads, and will aim to mitigate and manage any traffic reassignment that does take place following implementation. We are investing in advanced traffic signal technology to allow us to better manage traffic depending on differing conditions at any given time, and we are working to improve road user information so people can make informed journey choices before they travel.

Journey times along the A41

Some respondents expressed concern that CS11 would increase north-south journey times along the A41.

We carried out extensive design work and underwent an iterative traffic-modelling process in order to come up with a proposal which achieved the desired objectives while minimising the impact on journey times for general traffic and buses.

In response to feedback during consultation, we have made changes to the Swiss Cottage proposals to allow two turns which we had originally proposed to ban (see above). This has been done to address concerns about traffic reassigning from the A41 into minor roads. Allowing these turns means that journey time impacts for traffic

and buses on the A41 will be different to what we consulted on and, in some cases, journey times are predicted to be higher than those we consulted on. Updated traffic modelling information is provided in [Appendix A](#).

Journey times across north London

Some respondents expressed concern that the changes introduced as part of CS11, in particular removing the Swiss Cottage one-way system, would affect motor traffic journeys all over north London, including trips of people driving in and out of Greater London.

While we recognise that changing the layout of the Swiss Cottage one-way system will have some impacts on motor traffic in the local area, including changes to journey times in certain directions at certain times of day, our modelling does not indicate that the scheme will have major impacts across north London.

Thames Water works

Some respondents expressed concerned that Thames Water works in the Swiss Cottage area had caused congestion previously.

There were major works in Avenue Road between August 2015 and April 2016, with works involving the closure of Avenue Road between Adelaide Road and Acacia Road and lane closures on Avenue Road north of Adelaide Road. It was claimed that disruption associated with these works was indicative of the impact of removing the gyratory.

The Thames Water works took place with the current road layout – i.e. with Swiss Cottage still operating as a gyratory – and motor traffic had to be diverted via Finchley Road and Wellington Road due to the closure. The transformational scheme proposed at Swiss Cottage will introduce a completely different signal layout to the area, with two-way traffic on Finchley Road and Adelaide Road at Swiss Cottage. As such, the impact of the utility works cannot be compared to the CS11 proposals.

Road network resilience

Some respondents expressed concern that reducing the number of lanes operating through Swiss Cottage will reduce the resilience of the road network – i.e., the ability of the network to cope with incidents such as breakdowns, collisions other lane closures.

Many one-way traffic systems were introduced in the UK in the 1960s and 1970s because these systems are very efficient at moving large volumes of motor vehicles. The current road layout at Swiss Cottage is dominated by traffic and there are very few facilities for other road users. The CS11 proposals aim to rebalance the road layout to provide more space for pedestrians and cyclists and to transform the urban environment on Avenue Road. This does mean that the amount of space given to

motor vehicles will reduce overall, which will reduce the flexibility of the network at this location.

However, at Swiss Cottage gyratory two-way working will be reinstated on both Finchley Road and Adelaide Road and both of these roads will have at least two lanes for general traffic at all times.

If we decided to go ahead with access restrictions at The Regent's Park, these would only be in place at four of the eight gates. Vehicles would still be able to access the park through the other gates and restrictions would only be in place at peak times.

Banned turns

Some respondents expressed concern at one or more of the banned turns that formed part of the proposals. Some people felt that they would make journeys unnecessarily long, while others were concerned about the impact of motor traffic using different routes to get to its destination.

We only propose the introduction of a banned turn or traffic movement after carefully considering the potential impacts on motorists and other road users. We acknowledge that restrictions of this type can cause inconvenience and can divert motor traffic along different routes.

However, any impacts must be balanced against the wider benefits that banned movements can provide, such as improving safety for cyclists by removing conflicts with motor vehicles, as well as reducing journey times for other motorists by reducing the number of traffic light phases at a junction. The impacts arising from the banned turn must also be examined in the context of the wider benefits of the scheme. In the case of CS11, the benefits are a desirable increase in walking and cycling.

Having considered feedback received during the consultation, we have reviewed the banned turns proposed as part of this scheme, and have decided to make the following changes:

- We proposed banning the existing left turn from Finchley Road into College Crescent for all traffic. In the revised scheme, this turn will be banned for general traffic, and allowed for buses and cycles only
- We proposed banning the right turn from College Crescent into Finchley Road (which is not currently possible as a direct movement due to the gyratory system). In the revised scheme, this movement will be allowed for all traffic
- We proposed banning the right turn from Finchley Road southbound into Hilgrove Road (which is not currently possible as a direct movement due to the gyratory system). In the revised scheme, we aim to allow this movement for all traffic. However we will be investigating whether it would be possible to design this junction so that this turn could be banned on a part time basis

Other proposed banned turns will remain unchanged from consultation proposals.

We have carried out detailed assessment, including traffic modelling, to consider the impacts of the changes to permitted movements, which we have made in response to feedback received during consultation. Updated traffic modelling which shows the impacts of allowing these turns on journey times and traffic reassignment can be found in [Appendix A](#). If we decide that it is necessary to ban the right turn from Finchley Road southbound into Hilgrove Road on a part time basis, updated traffic modelling will be provided on our website.

Parents and the ‘school run’

Some respondents expressed concern about the scheme’s impact on parents driving their children to schools, with many mentioning the high density of schools in the Hampstead and Fitzjohn Avenue areas.

Under our proposals, all existing properties, including schools, within the area affected by the proposals and beyond will remain accessible by motor vehicle. The ‘school run’ is a major cause of motor traffic congestion in the morning and evening peak. In the long-term, we expect our proposals to make walking and cycling more attractive will contribute to reducing motor traffic congestion and improving road safety around schools by encouraging local people to walk or cycle school run trips, instead of driving.

The traffic modelling we carried out assessed the worst-case scenario for motor traffic in that it focused on the busiest hour in the morning and evening peak periods, chosen following an analysis of traffic counts.

Elderly and disabled drivers

Some respondents expressed concern that CS11 would have a disproportionately negative impact on elderly and disabled people, who they said are more likely to drive short local trips because of reduced mobility.

In developing this scheme, we have complied with the public sector equality duty set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, to ensure that impacts on groups of people with protected characteristics are identified, considered and mitigated as appropriate. An Equalities Impact Assessment was carried out as part of the development of the scheme, and the impact of the proposals on elderly and disabled people has been taken into consideration.

All road users will be affected by the new road layout and traffic management, with some journeys becoming quicker and some becoming slower. Our long-term aim is to improve conditions for walking and cycling, and in turn to help relieve congestion on public transport and the roads. This will benefit all public transport and road users, including elderly and disabled people who travel using those modes. It would also benefit elderly and disabled people who might like to cycle or cycle more, if conditions for cycling were made more appealing.

When conditions are safe and comfortable for cycling, there is strong evidence that cycling facilities are also used by elderly people, as well as by those with disabilities.

Cycles can act a mobility aid for those who find walking difficult or cannot walk at all. Some people with disabilities ride standard bicycles; others use one of the many types of non-standard bicycle available such as tandems, tricycles, hand cycles or electric bikes. The Department for Transport has called for an increase in awareness of the use of cycles as a mobility aid².

Our research found that 15% of Londoners with a disability already make trips by bicycle³, which is only slightly below the percentage of non-disabled people who said they use a bicycle (18%). Our research also identified that 20% of disabled people said they would “definitely” or “probably” use the Cycle Superhighways in the future³. In the Netherlands, where high-quality cycling provision is widespread, 24% of all trips taken by people over 65 are by bicycle, and 17% of all trips by people over 75 are by bicycle⁴.

Emergency services

Some respondents expressed concern about congestion increasing response times for emergency service vehicles.

We have liaised with emergency services to ensure that they are aware of the proposed changes to the road network and that their requirements have been considered. We will continue to engage with emergency services while we finalise our detailed designs .

Local businesses

Some respondents expressed concern about congestion disrupting local businesses wanting to deliver or receive goods and services by motor vehicle or losing custom due to customers not being able to access shops by motor vehicle.

Access will be maintained to all local businesses under the scheme proposals. The proposals are intended to transform the urban realm at Swiss Cottage, by helping to develop a sense of ‘place’ and to contribute towards the economic success of the area, in line with Camden Council’s Transport Strategy⁵. We will work closely with local businesses to minimise disruption during the construction of the scheme and to keep them informed.

² p40, Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy, 2016, https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/512895/cycling-and-walking-investment-strategy.pdf

³ p223 and p225, Travel in London: Understanding our Diverse Communities, 2015, <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/travel-in-london-understanding-our-diverse-communities.pdf>

⁴ http://ec.europa.eu/transport/road_safety/specialist/knowledge/pedestrians/pedestrians_and_cyclists_unprotected_road_users/walking_and_cycling_as_transport_modes_en#_1.2.3_Most_important

⁵ p132, Camden Transport Strategy, 2011, https://camden.gov.uk/ccm/cms-service/stream/asset/?asset_id=3440458&

Cycle Superhighways programme causing disruption

Some respondents expressed concern that other Cycle Superhighways such as the North-South route (CS6) and the East-West Route (CS3) have had a negative impact on motor traffic, and this would be the case with CS11 as well.

The majority of the construction work on the North-South and East-West Cycle Superhighways took place in 2015 and 2016, and these routes are not yet complete with works ongoing in several locations. As with most highway schemes, there is a bedding-in period where road users adapt to changes in the road layout. During this period, traffic and bus performance is reviewed and signal timings are adjusted and optimised wherever possible.

A full comparison of before and after journey times cannot usually be completed until 12 months after a scheme has completed and traffic signal strategies have been refined. Therefore, we do not yet have a full set of before and after data. However, initial studies of the routes look very positive. For example on CS5, which was completed in November 2015, inbound journey times for motor traffic in the morning peak are approximately the same as prior to works. This has been achieved despite the removal of a traffic lane. On CS North-South, southbound journey times have already reduced to approximately what was experienced before construction. Northbound journey times remain slightly longer than pre-construction, and we continue to monitor this.

Cycle Superhighways have the potential to carry significantly higher volumes of people than would be possible if the equivalent space was used for vehicular traffic. As the population of London continues to grow it is important to make the best possible use of the existing road space, and Cycle Superhighways are an important way of doing that.

Cyclists endangering motorists

Some respondents expressed concern that cyclists endanger motorists, and increases in cycling would exacerbate this problem.

We are not aware of any evidence that cyclists in Greater London pose a significant risk to motorists, nor that any increase in cycling would present significantly increased danger to people in motor vehicles. Nevertheless, our proposals would increase separation between cyclists and motorists along the route.

Impact on bus passengers

Bus journey times

Some respondents expressed concern about a predicted increase in journey times on some routes, particularly on route 31 and route C11.

We have made some changes to the proposals as a result of feedback received during consultation. We now propose to allow buses to make the left turn from Finchley Road into College Crescent. This change means the 268 can take a more direct route.

We have also changed the proposals to allow motor vehicles to turn right from College Crescent into Finchley Road and from Finchley Road into Hilgrove Road, in order to reduce the amount of traffic reassigning from main roads onto minor roads.

Our traffic-modelling has shown that allowing these turns changes the impacts on journey times for general traffic and buses. When the right turn from Finchley Road into Hilgrove Road is allowed, route 31 is likely to see a bigger increase in journey time in the eastbound direction on Hilgrove Road than we originally proposed. However, the 31 will see a smaller increase in journey time than we originally proposed as it travels westwards on Adelaide Road, where journey time increases are expected to be lower than under the original proposals.

Under our original proposals many bus routes travelling northwards and southwards on Finchley Road would have seen an overall decrease in journey time. The changes to the proposals mean that many of these routes will no longer see a decrease in journey time and some will see an increase, notably the 46 and the 187.

Because of this, we will be looking into whether it is possible to design the junction between Finchley Road and Hilgrove Road / Adelaide Road so that the right turn from Finchley Road into Hilgrove Road could be banned on a part-time basis. Vehicles would be able to make this turn most of the time, but the turn could be banned at the busiest times. This dynamic use of road space would help us to strike the best balance between the needs of different road users.

We have carried out traffic modelling to understand the impact that introducing the scheme and allowing the right turn from College Crescent into Finchley Road and the right turn from Finchley Road into Hilgrove Road would have, and this can be found in [Appendix A](#). Our assumption in this modelling is that both turns would be allowed at all times. If we decide to change the design of the junction between Finchley Road and Hilgrove Road / Adelaide Road this we will publish updated traffic modelling on our website.

Increase bus frequencies

Some respondents called for an increase in bus service frequencies, in particular for route 46. Capacity on bus routes across London is regularly reviewed. We carry out surveys to determine whether sufficient capacity is provided at different times of day. This also takes into account changes in usage trends and any new developments such as new housing, offices or shopping centres.

Route 46 was recently reviewed as part of our regular tendering programme and we found that capacity is well matched to demand on this route and no capacity issues

were identified. For this reason we have no plans to increase bus frequencies on this route at this time.

Moving / removing bus stops and interchange between bus routes

Some respondents expressed concern that, under the new road layout, there would be longer walks between some bus stops because some stops would be removed or because some buses would no longer stop at certain stops.

The removal of the Swiss Cottage one-way system is a major change to the road layout and it does require some changes to which stops different bus routes use. However, we are satisfied that our proposals provide suitable options for interchange between different routes.

The majority of bus routes passing through Swiss Cottage would stop in the same locations as they do at present. The 13, 113, 82, and 187 would continue to serve stop L on Finchley Road northbound and stop D or E on Avenue Road outside Swiss Cottage Library in the southbound direction as they do now, offering excellent connections between routes.

In order to keep journey times on route 31 to a minimum, it would no longer serve stops D or E on Avenue Road but would remain on Adelaide Road in the eastbound direction. A new stop would be created on Adelaide Road to allow people to connect with other routes, located only 100 metres away from stop E and 180 metres away from stop D. Route 31 would continue to serve stop L in the northbound direction.

Route 46 would no longer serve stop M on Finchley Road but would continue to serve stop F on College Crescent. Improved pedestrian crossing facilities on College Crescent and Finchley Road mean that people will be able to interchange with stop L on Finchley Road for northbound services (170 metres) and stops D (180 metres) and E (260 metres) on Avenue Road for southbound services.

Following consultation, we have also decided to make a change to the proposals to allow the right turn from College Crescent into Finchley Road for all vehicles and the left turn from Finchley Road into College Crescent for buses and cycles only (see the [Summary of Changes](#)). This means that route 268 can take a more direct route both to and from College Crescent without having to go down Avenue Road, reducing the journey time for this route. Passengers on route 268 will be able to interchange with other routes at stops L, D and E as outlined above and will not be delayed by having to go around the Swiss Cottage triangle.

We are satisfied that the proposals provide adequate options for interchange between different routes at Swiss Cottage.

Environment-friendly buses

Some respondents called for more low or zero emissions buses to improve air quality.

We have taken significant steps to reduce air pollution from our bus fleet. All buses in Greater London currently meet Euro IV standards or better for NOx. To support the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ), all double-decker buses operating in the Congestion Charging zone will be hybrid electric vehicles and all single-decker buses in the zone will emit nothing from their engine exhaust (i.e., they will be full electric or hydrogen models). In response to the Mayor's ambition for us to do more to reduce bus emissions, we are proposing the following additional improvements to reduce emissions from our bus fleet (see the consultation on air quality):

- Ensuring all of our buses in central London are compliant with the ULEZ emission standard ahead of its introduction (by 2019) and a commitment that our double-decker buses operating in the area will be hybrid
- Implementing up to 12 'Low Emission Bus Zones' across London – tackling the worst pollution hotspots by concentrating cleaner buses on the dirtiest routes. The first zones will be delivered in Putney High Street and Brixton/Streatham from 2017
- Expanding an innovative Euro VI bus retrofit programme to 3,000 buses by 2020 (up from 800) and to over 5,000 by 2021
- An ambition to purchase only hybrid or zero emission double deck buses from 2018

Bus driver training

Some respondents called for improved bus driver training to reduce road danger to other road users, particularly pedestrians and cyclists.

We and London's bus operators take road safety extremely seriously. London bus drivers undergo extensive classroom and on-road training to ensure they are aware of their responsibilities towards other road users, including vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists. For example, by early 2017 all of London's 24,500 bus drivers will have completed a Certificate of Professional Competence (CPC) training course raising their awareness of human behaviour and driver psychology, and how these two traits affect road safety. Training is regularly reviewed to ensure it meets the necessary skills for London's bus drivers to deliver safe bus operations.

Comment on cycling strategy

Benefits of cycling schemes

Some respondents questioned our rationale for building Cycle Superhighways, claiming there is no justification for CS11 or similar cycling schemes in Greater London.

CS11 is one of a number of Cycle Superhighways either already in place or at the delivery stage. On completion, the Cycle Superhighways will contribute to a London-wide network of safe, direct and comfortable cycle routes. We recognise – as is the case in other major cities such as New York and Paris – that sustainable transport plays an important role in providing safe, healthy and convenient transport choices to the population. Greater London is expected to increase in size by up to one million people over the next decade, with up to two million additional people living here by 2036. In order to handle this extra population growth, we are implementing an ambitious and effective programme to improve transport across Greater London.

The package of measures to improve transport in the city includes major projects such as upgrades to London Underground, the Overground, the Elizabeth Line (Crossrail) and Crossrail 2. Within this programme £2 billion will be spent on creating Healthy Streets, including investment in walking, cycling and improving public spaces and air quality. The Cycle Superhighways form part of our investment programme, which will improve our roads for everyone. As well as improving cycling provision, we are planning numerous transformational projects to provide better roads, junctions, bridges and tunnels, along with a major bus priority programme. The roads investment programme will also see upgraded traffic signals, new pedestrian crossings, trees and expanded footways and urban realm projects. This programme of works represents the biggest investment in London's roads in a generation, and is a core part of our strategy to prepare Greater London for the expected population growth.

We have identified a range of positive impacts that result from delivering the current cycling portfolio, of which the Cycle Superhighways are a central component. These include substantial benefits relating to safety, health, the environment and public realm.

Cycling can help relieve pressure on the public transport system when implemented as part of an integrated transport strategy, for example, where capacity is limited (e.g. some bus routes), or where additional capacity programmes would be extremely expensive (Underground, rail). In particular, routes can play a particularly important role in catering for significant numbers of commuters during the peak hours.

Cycling and health

Lack of physical activity is currently one of the biggest threats to the health of Londoners. It is needed for the healthy functioning of every part of the human body and reduces the risk of dying prematurely and developing a range of chronic diseases including diabetes, dementia, depression and the two biggest killers in London, heart disease and cancer. Active travel is likely to be the main way many

people in London meet their physical activity needs because it is easily incorporated into their daily routine⁶.

It has been estimated that 60,000 years of perfect health could be gained each year across London's population if people swapped motorised modes for those short journeys that could realistically be walked or cycled instead. This can be monetised as over £2 billion each year in health economic benefits⁶.

Cyclist contributions towards road funding

Some respondents claimed that cyclists do not contribute towards upkeep of the roads and so cycling schemes are not justified.

The maintenance of roads in the UK is currently funded through general taxation and not through specific taxes on road users, such as Vehicle Excise Duty (VED). Therefore, most cyclists already contribute to the cost of maintaining roads by virtue of paying income tax, VAT, council tax, and so on. We are aware of potential changes to Government legislation that will support road maintenance through funding from VED from 2017. However vehicles with zero emissions, including cyclists, would continue to be exempt, as would many Band A vehicles. Those exempt from VED include cyclists, electric car drivers, drivers of the lowest-emitting diesel and petrol vehicles (<100g CO₂/km), disabled drivers, drivers of vehicles built before 1976, and agricultural vehicles.

Levels of local cycling

Some respondents expressed the view that CS11 is not needed because of what they perceive to be low levels of cycling currently along the proposed route.

Demand analysis has been carried out and identified significant latent demand for cycling in this area – i.e. we believe there is a significant 'potential market' for cycling in this area, which could be realised if we put in place the right infrastructure.

Our London Travel Demand Survey (2013-14) found that 66% of all car journeys in Greater London are under three miles, and do not involve carrying goods or passengers that might require them to be driven. Encouraging people to walk or cycle these journeys is important to free up road space for vital journeys – e.g., those vehicles that are carrying large quantities of goods or drivers unable to use of other modes such as public transport, walking or cycling.

Where we have built Cycle Superhighways previously, we have seen significant increases in cycling rates as a result of more people choosing to cycle and existing cyclists diverting from other roads to the new cycle routes. For example, in the months after its opening, we recorded a 73 per cent increase in cycling on Cycle Superhighway 5 (CS5) across Vauxhall Bridge.

⁶ p22 & p24, Improving the Health of Londoners, <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/improving-the-health-of-londoners-transport-action-plan.pdf>

In 2014 (the latest year for which figures are available), there were 645,000 journeys a day made by bicycle, which was a 10 per cent increase over 2013. This is equivalent to one-fifth of all daily Underground trips, or slightly more than the number of trips on the Bakerloo, Circle and Hammersmith & City lines combined. In Zone 1, during the morning rush hour, 32 per cent of all vehicles on the roads are now bicycles. On some main roads in central London, up to 70 per cent of vehicles are bicycles. If trends continue, the number of people commuting to central London by bicycle will overtake the number commuting by car by 2019.

Cost-benefit analysis

Some respondents called for more information about the costs and benefits of the scheme to be published during consultation.

The CS11 business case / cost-benefit analysis is currently in draft form. It requires data relating to the road layout – for example, the extent and dimensions of proposed cycling infrastructure, and the final outputs of traffic modelling showing expected impacts on journey times for different modes, therefore a final scheme design must be agreed before it can be completed. It will include an assessment of the monetised impact of any changes in journey time which will be based on detailed traffic modelling.

Significant changes to the CS11 proposals at Swiss Cottage are being made in response to feedback received during the consultation (see the [Summary of Changes](#)). Further work will be undertaken before the proposals for The Regent's Park can be finalised. An updated draft cost-benefit analysis of the route will inform the decision making process until the proposals for The Regent's Park have been finalised. A full cost-benefit analysis will be completed before any construction works on the route begin.

Local knowledge

Some respondents expressed concern that CS11 had not been planned by people familiar with the area.

As well as applying our own detailed knowledge of the area through which CS11 will run, we also worked with key stakeholders such as the London Borough of Camden, Westminster City Council, and The Royal Parks to ensure we had a strong understanding of local issues.

Before submitting our proposals to public consultation, we carried out a number of pre-engagement exercises with residents' associations, road user groups and key stakeholders in the local area. A full list of engagement and consultation activities can be found in Chapter 2 of our Consultation Report.

Route is already cycle-friendly

Some respondents claimed that the route, or parts of the route, chosen for CS11 is already cycle-friendly.

The route for CS11 was chosen after extensive feasibility investigations, including understanding where there is unfulfilled demand for cycling and current barriers to cycling. Swiss Cottage, in particular, was identified as a significant barrier to north-south cycling journeys between north-west London and central London. We are satisfied that our proposals provide a significant increase in the quality of cycling provision across the whole scheme, and will help make cycling safer for existing cyclists, and also a more attractive choice for those groups that are currently under-represented among London cyclists such as women, children and the elderly.

Existing cycling facilities

Some respondents claimed that there was no justification for building CS11 because existing cycling facilities, such as the newest Cycle Superhighways, are not well used.

Our evaluations of the newest Cycle Superhighways, such as the East-West Superhighway along the Embankment and CS5 through Vauxhall, are still in progress, but early evidence from cycle counts on these routes is very positive.

Initial counts suggest the vast majority of cyclists are using the new facilities, with more than 90 per cent using the segregated tracks on both CSEW and CSNS, and that the routes are well used:

- On Victoria Embankment on CS3 (EW), the number of cyclists has increased by 54 per cent against pre-construction figures. At its busiest, cyclists made up 52 per cent of all traffic
- On Blackfriars Bridge on CS6 (NS), the number of cyclists has increased by 55 per cent against pre-construction figures. At its busiest, cyclists made up 70 per cent of all traffic
- On Vauxhall Bridge on CS5, the number of cyclists has increased by 73 per cent against pre-construction figures

Cycling is seasonal and weather-dependent

Some respondents said there was no value in promoting cycling because this form of transport is subject to fluctuating popularity due to climate and weather.

While we accept that levels of cycling – like levels of walking – do increase and decrease in the short-term according to the weather and climate, evidence shows there have been steady increases in the overall popularity of cycling during the past decade. Cycling has a strong role to play in providing transport options for

Londoners, helping to reduce crowding on roads and public transport, and providing healthy and cost-effective transport options for millions of people.

Cyclists endanger themselves

Some respondents claimed that cyclists are responsible for collisions, and so spending money on cycling infrastructure is neither justified nor effective in improving cyclist safety.

According to a Department for Transport-commissioned report⁷, in collisions involving an adult cyclist and a driver, police found the driver to be solely responsible in 60-75% of case, with the cyclist at fault 17-25% of the time. The study of collisions involving cyclists found that very few cyclists were injured or killed through acting illegally, such as failing to use lights at night or disobeying traffic signals.

We are satisfied that designing routes where cyclists are separated from high volumes and/or speeds of motor traffic is a significant factor in make cycling a safer and more comfortable experience available to everyone.

Route alignment

CS11 to Brent Cross

Some respondents asked why the proposed route alignment did not continue beyond Swiss Cottage to Brent Cross.

At present, we do not have any proposals for the CS11 route north from Swiss Cottage towards Brent Cross. We are satisfied that the CS11 route that we consulted on from Swiss Cottage to Portland Place can operate successfully irrespective of whether there is any route extension north of Swiss Cottage. For this reason, we decided to consult on CS11 in its current form.

Alternative cycle routes exist or planned

Some respondents expressed the opinion that CS11 is not necessary as alternative cycle routes already exist in this area or are being planned.

There are no current cycle routes in this area providing the same level of comfort and safety as the proposals for CS11. While several Cycle Grid routes pass close to the proposed route for CS11, these cycle routes follow different roads and link to different locations. A network formed by the Cycle Superhighways, Mini-Hollands, Quietways and London Cycle Grid is being designed to provide efficient and direct cycle journeys where possible, and in some locations – particularly Zone 1 – that

⁷ “Collisions Involving Cyclists on Britain’s Roads: Establishing the Causes” by J. Knowles, S. Adams, R. Cuerden, T. Savill, S. Reid and M. Tight, 2009, <https://trl.co.uk/reports/PPR445>

network is likely to be relatively dense to satisfy particularly high demand for cycling in the city centre and to cater for local trips as well as longer journeys.

Alternative route along Charlbert Street

Some respondents suggested alternative route alignments for CS11. Some of these respondents said their alternative route would have less impact on motor traffic than the chosen route alignment. One route suggested was along St John's Wood Park-Ordnance Hill-Charlbert Street.

We considered a number of different alignments for CS11, and chose the current alignment after a lengthy feasibility process involving the London Borough of Camden, Westminster City Council and The Royal Parks. We do not consider Charlbert Bridge to be a suitable point for the Cycle Superhighway to enter Regent's Park because of the relatively narrow width of the bridge and the large volume of pedestrians that use it, which would lead to conflict between cyclists and pedestrians at busy periods.

Cycle Superhighways aim to provide cyclists with direct routes wherever possible, and a route using St John's Wood Park, Ordnance Hill and Charlbert Street then North Gate (rather than Charlbert Bridge) would mean cyclists would have to take a significant detour.

Alternative route along Winchester Road

Some respondents called for CS11 to route along Winchester Road, which runs parallel with the section of Avenue Road north of Adelaide Road, to avoid having the remove the one-way system at Swiss Cottage.

The northern end of Winchester Road terminates at Eton Avenue or Adamson Road, neither of which provides a usefully direct northern onward journey for cyclists. Similarly, at the southern end of Winchester Road, CS11 would follow King Henry's Road, Harley Road, Wadham Gardens and Elsworthy Road before rejoining the proposed route along Avenue Road. Neither of these routes is considered viable for CS11, which is intended to provide direct and convenient route from Swiss Cottage to the West End, including safe passage through the one-way system, which is a major barrier to north-south cycling journeys.

Cycle routes away from main roads

Some respondents called for cycle routes to be built away from arterial roads or major junctions in order to minimise their impact on motor traffic.

Whenever we design a cycle route, we aim to find the best balance between factors such as directness, capacity, comfort, and impact on other modes. In some instances, the optimum solution involves aligning a route along a major road or through a major junction. In other instances, the best solution is found using a another route such through a park or along a relatively minor road. We will continue

to look at each route in a per-case basis, with the long-term aim of creating a safer, comfortable, high-capacity cycling network across Greater London.

Extend to Oxford Street

Some respondents called for CS11 to extend south to Oxford Street, and other central London destinations.

New Cavendish Street was chosen as the most appropriate point to start and end the route because this will connect to the proposed east-west Quietway 7. On completion, CS11 will form part of a network of cycle routes comprising Cycle Superhighways, Quietways and the Central London Grid. This network will provide safe, convenient and comfortable journeys to and around the city centre.

Environmental impact

Air pollution

Some respondents expressed concern that our proposals would increase air pollution by making existing motor traffic journeys slower or longer. It was suggested that idling motor traffic is more of a polluting factor than moving motor traffic and that, by creating congestion, CS11 would become a negative factor in London's drive to improve air quality.

Air pollution is one of the most significant challenges facing London, and is an issue we and the Mayor of London take very seriously. The equivalent of up to 9,400 deaths per year in London are attributed to air quality related illnesses. The Mayor has called for new proposals to urgently tackle London's current poor air quality, and we have developed detailed proposals for the implementation of an Emissions Surcharge (ES), and ideas for improving the Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ). We are currently consulting on [several proposals to improve air quality](#).

A preliminary draft environmental evaluation has been carried out for CS11, based on initial traffic modelling results. The initial analysis indicates that the scheme is likely to result in some localised benefits, particularly in terms of improved noise and air quality conditions as a result of improved traffic flows at certain locations, such as Avenue Road and Outer Circle. There are no indications of route-wide environmental disbenefits. Where disbenefits are likely to arise, these tend to be of a localised nature.

The traffic data used in the initial analysis covered a large section of London so that the effect of traffic diverting to alternative routes could be considered. Some localised noise and air quality disbenefits may occur as a result of changes to traffic flows at certain locations. However, the changes in traffic flows are likely to

redistribute air quality and noise emissions across the area, without an increase in overall emission levels.

Since the initial analysis was undertaken, as outlined in the Summary of changes, we have revised our proposals to reduce the likelihood of motor traffic reassignment into nearby minor roads taking place. The initial analysis did not take account of these revisions and requires further updating. However, the changes to traffic flow are not expected to result in an increase in overall emission levels across the area.

Pollution and existing Cycle Superhighways

Some respondents claimed that the opening of the East-West Cycle Superhighway had caused air quality to deteriorate because of increased motor traffic congestion in roads near the route. They expressed concern that CS11 would have a similar negative impact on air quality.

It is very difficult to link changes in air quality at a particular location to specific schemes because of the number of contributory factors to air quality. However, in general, the Cycle Superhighways are not traffic-generating schemes, even though they can result in some redistribution of existing motor traffic flows.

We continue to monitor the impact of all the latest Cycle Superhighways as part of our evaluation process.

Tree-planting

Some respondents expressed concern about the removal of some trees, with calls for additional tree-planting as part of the scheme.

We need to remove six trees to introduce two-way operation at Swiss Cottage. We are proposing to plant at least 20 new trees to replace those removed, subject to site investigations and ground conditions. Trial holes and assessments will be undertaken to determine locations for these new trees.

Impact on cycling

Segregation

Some respondents called for more segregation to be introduced across the scheme, particularly on Avenue Road and the Outer Circle of The Regent's Park.

Separation or segregation between cyclists and general traffic can take a number of different forms and can vary in extent. Cyclists can be physically separated from motor traffic through measures ranging from off-road routes and the use of advisory or mandatory cycle lanes through to full physical segregation via a second kerb line. Separation can also be achieved through the use of road layouts and signal timings at junctions, which can reduce or avoid conflicts between cyclists and turning traffic.

There are practical difficulties that mean that introducing kerb segregation on Avenue Road south of Swiss Cottage is not the best option. The available road width is too narrow to enable the construction of a 1.5 metre cycle track with physical separation from vehicular traffic. The avenue of mature trees means it is not feasible to narrow the footways to create more road space. There are also a large number of residential driveways with vehicle crossovers on Avenue Road, which would require regular breaks in any form of separation.

Instead of providing a kerb-segregated cycle track on Avenue Road, the CS11 designs aim to improve the environment for cycling through other measures. The removal of the Swiss Cottage gyratory and the introduction of access restrictions at the North Gate into Regent's Park are expected to lead to a significant drop in the volume of traffic using Avenue Road. Mandatory cycle lanes will be provided and the existing parking and waiting restrictions will be reconfigured to ensure the cycle lane remains clear at all times. The proposals address an existing collision issue at the junction between Queen's Grove and Elsworthy Road. A separate signal for southbound cyclists will be provided at the junction with Prince Albert Road to enable them to enter The Regent's Park without being exposed to conflict with turning vehicles. These measures in combination offer an appropriate level of protection for cyclists and will make Avenue Road a comfortable and pleasant route for cycling.

In The Regent's Park, we worked closely with The Royal Parks to come up with a set of proposals which are appropriate for the park, which has an important and unique heritage. The options put forward at consultation offered the opportunity to create a safer environment for cyclists through a spectrum of different measures, all aimed at reducing the speed and volume of traffic in the park.

The objectives of our proposals in The Regent's Park were to improve safety and comfort for cyclists and pedestrians. We will now be taking another look at our proposals for The Regent's Park to explore whether there might be other options which achieve these objectives. We will review the advantages of providing segregation for cyclists within the park as part of this process.

On Portland Place, two options were proposed: one offering advisory cycle lanes and one offering segregation. Having considered the feedback we received during consultation, we will go forward with Option B, which offered segregation.

Encouraging new cyclists

Some respondents expressed concern the proposals would not be successful in encouraging new cyclists.

Safety, or perception of safety, is highlighted as the main reason both would-be and existing cyclists give about why they don't cycle, or don't cycle more⁸. Cyclists willing

⁸ Mekuria, Maaza, Peter Furth and Hilary Nixon. *Low-Stress Bicycling and Network Connectivity*. Mineta Transportation Institute Report 11-19, May 2012.

to ride in ‘unprotected’ heavy traffic represent a small proportion of the population and these individuals are likely to already be out on the roads⁹. The mainstream population – which must be attracted to cycling in order to reach existing mode share targets – is characterised as ‘traffic-intolerant’. The ‘traffic-intolerant’ population is estimated to represent nearly 90 per cent of all current and potential cyclists. As such, if we are to attract more people to cycling in London, it is important that the routes we implement on busier sections of the network are safe and are perceived to be safe.

The proposals are designed to provide a high-quality cycling environment that is welcoming to people who do not currently cycle, as well as attracting existing cyclists. Women, children and older people are currently under-represented among those who cycle in London. It is expected that CS11 will encourage more people to take up cycling along the route.

Santander Cycles docking stations

Some respondents called for more Santander Cycles docking stations along the CS11 alignment.

At present, the southern section of the route is well served by docking stations, while the northern section (Avenue Road north of Allitsen Road) is outside the northern extents of the docking station network. We are not currently proposing to extend Santander Cycles further north, but if the scheme is extended in future we would investigate opportunities to extend the number of docking stations on or near cycling corridors such as CS11.

Safer junctions to access CS11

Some respondents called for cyclists to be separated from motor traffic at more of the junctions connecting cyclists to CS11, calling for greater use of cycling-specific traffic lights to increase safety.

CS11 aims to improve safety for cyclists at all of the junctions on the route. Cycle specific traffic lights have been proposed at 6 junctions along the route, but separate signals are not the only way of improving safety for cyclists. In other locations alternative measures have been used, such as banned turns to reduce the risk of conflict between turning vehicles and cyclists, reduced traffic, and two-stage right turns. The CS11 proposals focus on cyclists travelling in the north-south direction. Wherever possible we have also catered for movements in other directions, although this has not been possible at every junction.

⁹ Geller, Roger. *Four Types of Cyclists*. City of Portland, Oregon Office of Transportation, 2007. <http://www.portlandonline.com/transportation/index.cfm?a=158497&c=44671>

Connecting CS11 to Euston and Waterloo

Some respondents called for CS11 to connect to other major destinations in Greater London such as Euston and Waterloo stations.

CS11 will form part of a network of new cycle routes, including cycle grid routes which will link with CS11 on Allitsen Road, Devonshire Street, New Cavendish Street and Gloucester Gate. Once complete cyclists will be able to use either the Hyde Park to Fitzrovia Cycle Grid link (via New Cavendish Street) or the cycle grid link from Gloucester Gate which joins Quietway 1 to reach the North-South cycle superhighway (CS6) which in turn provides connections to the East-West route and many other links. The Mayor of London has committed to continuing to invest in cycling in London and it is hoped that CS11 will form part of a growing network of cycle routes in the long term.

Raised junctions

Some respondents expressed concern about the use of raised junctions in The Regent's Park, in particular drawing attention to the use of heritage materials, such as granite setts, which it was felt could compromise cycling safety.

Raised junctions were proposed for the park following extensive engagement with a number of stakeholder groups before the consultation. While we recognise that some cyclists who use the Outer Circle for leisure cycling or cycle training would prefer the road to remain completely level without the introduction of raised tables, we have aimed to find a scheme which balances the needs of different road users.

We will be reviewing our proposals for The Regent's Park to see whether there are any alternative measures which could deliver the objectives to improve the environment on the Outer Circle for pedestrians and cyclists. The possibility of implementing raised tables as outlined in the consultation has not been ruled out, but we will also be exploring other options to reduce the speed and volume of traffic in the park.

Advanced Stop Lines (ASLs)

Some respondents expressed concern about the proposed use of Advanced Stop Lines (ASLs) at some junctions because they perceived these as being dangerous for cyclists.

ASLs provide a visible waiting area for cyclists, ahead of motor traffic. In London, ASLs are well used by cyclists and effective in providing priority to cyclists who have stopped at the traffic signals by allowing them to position themselves in front of motorised vehicles.

On CS11 ASLs will be used in conjunction with other measures to improve safety for cyclists, for example banned turns for vehicles to prevent conflict between cyclists

and turning vehicles. At many other locations on the route, cyclists have been given their own signal to separate them in time and space from motor traffic.

Parking in cycle lanes

Some respondents called for increased enforcement of regulations banning drivers from parking in cycle lanes.

Parking is prohibited on much of the CS11 route. Where it is allowed, the proposals have been designed to ensure that cycle routes are not blocked by parked vehicles. On Avenue Road some parking would be moved onto the footway and the existing single yellow line would be made a double yellow line, with no waiting or loading permitted at any time, to ensure the mandatory cycle lane is not blocked by parked vehicles. On Portland Place, the segregated option (Option B) will be taken forward (see the [Summary of Changes](#)). In this option, the cycle lane is located next to the footway, on the inside of parked vehicles, with a 1 metre buffer to protect cyclists from being hit by car doors as they open and to allow passengers in any parked cars to get out without blocking the cycle lane.

Parking restrictions on CS11 will continue to be enforced by ourselves and local councils as they are elsewhere on the network.

Cycling provision in Greater London

Some respondents called for improved cycling provision across Greater London.

CS11 forms part of a broader strategy to encourage more cycling and walking in Greater London. Together, our Cycle Superhighways and Quietways programmes are contributing towards the creation of a network of high-quality cycle routes across the city. Cycle Superhighways carry higher flows and are more direct, while Quietways are designed to link key destinations largely using back roads, parks and waterways. In addition, our pilot Mini-Holland schemes are transforming Outer London town centres in Enfield, Kingston and Waltham Forest into areas more welcoming for walking and cycling. Within this programme £2 billion will be spent on creating Healthy Streets, including investment in walking, cycling and improving, public spaces and air quality.

Cycling Level of Service ratings (CLOs)

Some respondents called for proposed schemes to be given 'before' and 'after' Cycling Level of Service (CLOs) ratings, as described in the [London Cycling Design Standards](#) (LCDS), so it is clear what are the improvements in cycling provision.

During the design development of CS11 the existing provision for cyclists was assessed, with consideration given to the six design outcomes set out in the London Cycling Design Standards: safety, directness, coherence, comfort, attractiveness and adaptability. A benefits realisation exercise will be undertaken post implementation of the scheme, to identify the improvements brought about by CS11.

Impact on pedestrians

Pedestrian facilities

Some respondents expressed concern that the scheme prioritised cycling at the expense of pedestrians.

The Mayor's vision to create 'Healthy Streets' aims to reduce traffic, pollution and noise, create more attractive, accessible and people-friendly roads where anyone can enjoy spending time and being physically active. In line with that vision, CS11 was conceived as a scheme to create a safer cycling route, but we have also made sure the scheme included significant improvements to the pedestrian environment across the affected area. The measures specifically proposed include:

- Installation of 13 new signalised pedestrian crossings across the route
- Conversion of 4 existing crossings at Swiss Cottage from staggered to straight-across
- Pedestrian countdown installed at every suitable crossing along the route
- Footways at Swiss Cottage widened wherever possible, notably at in front of Eton Avenue and the Ye Olde Swiss Cottage public house
- Transformation of the urban realm on Avenue Road at Swiss Cottage with the creation of a new public space outside the library and leisure centre
- New planting, including a new avenue of trees
- New street furniture at Swiss Cottage to improve the public realm

Overall, these changes will provide significant improvements to pedestrian safety and make for a more appealing experience at these locations. We have not yet made a decision about our proposals for The Outer Circle of Regent's Park and we will be exploring alternative options. Pedestrians are a priority for The Royal Parks and we will take the needs of pedestrians into consideration when considering what measures to take forward in the park.

Pedestrian crossing wait times

Some respondents expressed concern that pedestrian wait times would increase, particularly at Swiss Cottage.

As we set out in our consultation materials, some pedestrian wait times will increase as part of our proposals for CS11 – a result of enabling two-way working for traffic through Swiss Cottage. We have minimised increases in pedestrian wait times as much as possible.

Pedestrian crossing movements along CS11 have been simplified, with staggered crossings replaced with straight crossings wherever possible. Pedestrian wait times are generally higher at straight crossings than at staggered crossings, but this is offset by the benefit of being able to cross the road in a more direct way. We will continue to review signal timings and look for opportunities to reduce waiting times following implementation.

Overall, for the reasons set out at the start of this section, we expect a substantial net benefit to pedestrians as an outcome of implementing CS11.

Cycling and pedestrians

Some respondents expressed concern that CS11 will encourage more cycling, creating increased road danger for pedestrians.

While we accept that a minority of cyclists behave in an anti-social manner (see below), evidence supports the view that cycling in Greater London presents a relatively low risk of harm to pedestrians. In particular, cycling carries a much reduced risk of harm to pedestrians when compared with motor traffic.

Creating safer cycle routes provides people with an alternative to driving, potentially reducing the number of vehicles on the roads (for example, in the mornings and evenings during the school run). Rather than increasing danger, the measures proposed are likely to reduce vehicle volumes, reducing the overall risk to all road users in the area.

Cyclist behaviour

Some respondents expressed concern about cyclist behaviour presenting increased risk to pedestrians.

We acknowledge concerns raised about cyclist behaviour, although our research shows that most cyclists ride responsibly, and that cyclists are no more likely to disobey road rules than other road users.

We promote adherence to the Highway Code by all road users and encourage 'responsible cycling' and mutual respect between cyclists and other road users. We work to eliminate offences such as jumping red lights, cycling on the pavement and cycling at night without lights. We do this using police enforcement and educational programmes, as well as marketing and engagement campaigns.

We recognise that some pavement cyclists break the law (sometimes to avoid the dangers of motor traffic). However, we anticipate that providing dedicated facilities for cyclists will discourage people from riding on pavements.

We contribute funding towards the Metropolitan Police's Cycle Safety Team and are working on a strategic enforcement plan, taking into account all activities. The Cycle Safety Team will patrol all new Cycle Superhighways when they open, encouraging appropriate behaviour by all road users and enforcing compliance.

For more information about the extensive work that we undertake to improve the behaviour of all road users, including cyclists, please see [Appendix B](#)

Cycle Superhighways and fast cycling

Some respondents expressed concern that the introduction of a Cycle Superhighway would encourage people to cycle faster in this area, creating more road danger.

On completion, CS11 will provide for safer and more direct cycle journeys between Swiss Cottage and the West End. Due to the implementation of new cycle-friendly measures, we expect cycling journeys to become more attractive to types of Londoners who are currently under-represented among London cyclists such as women, children and the elderly. These groups may cycle less quickly than men or younger people, who are currently the types of people most likely to cycle currently in London. We also expect existing road cyclists to adapt their behaviour due to no longer feeling the need to keep up with motor traffic. As such, we expect the Cycle Superhighways to encourage more cycling journeys at slower speeds than currently take place.

Impact on equality

Equality Act 2010

Some respondents expressed concern that we have failed to consider our duties under the Equality Act 2010, in particular as relates to age and disability.

We are fully aware of our obligations pursuant to the public sector equality duty set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which requires us to pay due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, the need to advance equality of opportunity, and to foster good relations by reference to people with protected characteristics. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. As part of our decision-making process on the proposals for Cycle Superhighways, we have taken into account potential impacts on those with protected characteristics and the need to ensure that their interests are taken into account. This is a continuing duty and as such we will keep any impacts on protected groups under review as the scheme progresses.

When considering the design of our streets, we closely consider the needs of all users throughout the design process, in particular to ensure we have accounted for the needs of those with mobility issues.

For CS11, we completed an Equality Impact Assessment at the outset of the project, with the purpose of reviewing potential impacts on equality target groups, included disabled people and the elderly. This document was updated throughout the development of the scheme and will be kept updated

The consultation also provided an opportunity for those with protected characteristics to give feedback on our proposals. For more information about how the consultation itself accounted for the needs of those with protected characteristics, see Chapter 2 of our Consultation Report.

In addition, we complied with established guidance, such as the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, which includes detailed requirements for disabled people.

Disabled parking

Some respondents expressed concern about the impact of new parking regulations on older people and people with disabilities, saying it would make it difficult for people to have visitors, requiring people to park further away in side roads.

Surveys have shown that demand for parking on Avenue Road is generally lower than the current provision, so although there will be a reduction in the amount of residents' parking bays available the remaining provision should be sufficient to meet demand.

At Swiss Cottage there are no residents' parking bays but we have proposed to reduce the amount of parking and the length of some loading and disabled parking bays has been reduced. We have ensured that options remain for disabled parking at every location at Swiss Cottage where we have reduce the availability of parking overall.

Cyclists with disabilities

Some respondents expressed concern that CS11 would not be suitable for cyclists with disabilities.

We are satisfied that our designs will ensure CS11 will be suitable for use by cyclists with disabilities, including those using adapted bicycles such as hand cycles and tricycles. Our designs adhere as closely as possible to the principles set out in our London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS), which set out guidelines to ensure suitability for all types of cyclists.

Impact on parking

Reduce parking

Some respondents called for a widespread reduction in parking to accommodate improved cycling provision, particularly on Park Crescent.

When designing cycling facilities, we must consider the parking and loading needs of local residents, organisations and businesses. We must also consider the needs of disabled drivers, who might rely on disabled parking bays. For this reason, we aim to minimise the impact of schemes on parking and loading bays whenever possible.

We have taken parking into account when designing CS11 and ensured that where cycle lanes are not separated physically from motor vehicles, they will not be blocked by parking.

Two options for Portland Place were included in the consultation, and we will be progressing Option B which provides a segregated cycle facility. Neither Option B nor the alternative Option A proposed the removal of parking or the provision of segregation on Park Crescent. However, following feedback received during the consultation, Westminster City Council has agreed to look again at the design for Park Crescent to investigate whether alternative options which remove parking and provide a higher level of service for cyclists on this short stretch of road are feasible.

Impact on freight, deliveries and servicing

Freight and HGVs

Some respondents expressed concern that we had not considered the needs of the freight industry and the movements of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) when making changes to major arterial routes.

The freight and fleet industry provides a vital role in London, and we worked with them while developing our proposals. We will continue to work closely with them to discuss any outstanding issues and ensure deliveries across London can be made safely and efficiently. We are aware of a number of major developments in this area, not least the lorry movements associated with HS2, and several large property developments in this area. For more details on how they affect the scheme, see [p17](#).

In the coming months, we will begin working with businesses on Finchley Road on a study to understand their loading requirements and we will be reviewing the proposed hours of operation of loading bays on Finchley Road at Swiss Cottage following this process to ensure they are appropriate.

Freight vehicles using different routes

Some respondents expressed concern that the proposed banned turns would lead to HGVs using alternative roads, potentially smaller and more residential in nature.

We have made changes to the proposals to allow all vehicles to make two of the turns that we had originally proposed to ban. This should ensure that most HGVs will still be able to use their current routes and will reduce the possibility of HGVs and other goods vehicles reassigning into minor roads.

We have retained the banned left turn from Finchley Road into College Crescent in our updated proposals. Some respondents were concerned that there would not be a viable route for HGVs to get into Hampstead from the north because this movement would no longer be possible. We have looked at our traffic counts, which show that

just two HGVs made this movement during the AM peak and one during the PM peak. We are satisfied that it is will still be possible for these vehicles to access Hampstead using alternative routes and that the volume of HGVs likely to change their route is sufficiently low that there is unlikely to be significant detrimental impact on alternative roads.

We actively work with those making and receiving deliveries to ensure they are made at the right time and in the safest, cleanest vehicle and we will continue to work with businesses following the implementation of the scheme to address any issues which arise.

Impact on taxis and private hire

Taxi parking bays

Some respondents expressed concern that the proposed taxi rank in Finchley would impact on the abnormal loads using this route.

The proposals we consulted on included a new taxi rank on the eastern side of Finchley Road, next to the exit from Swiss Cottage tube station. Following feedback received during the consultation, we propose moving the taxi rank to the eastern side of College Crescent, near the junction with Avenue Road, in front of bus stop G. This taxi rank is intended to tie in with Night Tube services on the Jubilee line, so it will be operational only between 11pm and 6am.

Impact on road safety

20mph speed limit

Some respondents called for a 20mph speed limit across the whole CS11 route.

We recognise there is strong evidence that shows 20mph speed limits make roads safer for all road users, with proven links between lower speeds, reduced collision frequency and reduced injury severities.

Our interventions across the CS11 scheme address safety in different ways depending on the location. Where physical separation between cyclists and motor vehicles is provided a 20mph speed limit is not always necessary. However, on Avenue Road through Swiss Cottage we have proposed to introduce a 20mph speed limit in view of our aim to transform the urban realm at this location.

In The Regent's Park, we have committed to working with The Royal Parks to explore how a 20mph speed limit could be achieved for the park. This would take

place while we review the proposals we consulted on to see whether there are any alternatives that would achieve the same objectives.

The section of Avenue Road between Norfolk Road and Adelaide Road lies in Camden and already has a 20mph speed limit, in line with the London Borough of Camden's borough-wide policy. The southern half of Avenue Road is controlled by Westminster City Council, and the speed limit is currently 30mph. Westminster City are currently updating their policy on 20mph and are considering trials of 20mph speed limits in selected areas.

Concern about poor driver behaviour

Some respondents expressed concern about what they perceived as widespread poor standards of driver behaviour, highlighting problems such as aggressive driving, mobile phone use, and speeding.

We work with the police to improve the standards of all road users, including motorists. For more information about this work, please see Appendix B.

Section 1: Swiss Cottage

Impact on motor traffic

Avenue Road open to motor traffic southbound

Some respondents called for Avenue Road, north of Adelaide Road, to have at least one lane kept open for general traffic heading southbound, maintaining separation for cyclists but reducing the impact on motor traffic.

A number of options for Swiss Cottage were investigated when the scheme was first proposed, including variations of full or partial gyratory removal. The possibility of allowing general traffic to use Avenue Road was considered at this stage. We and our borough partners assessed these options against their benefits and disbenefits for different road users. Allowing general traffic to use Avenue Road southbound is expected to result in an increase in journey times for buses and general traffic, as the capacity at the junction of Avenue Road and Adelaide Road would be reduced. Furthermore, allowing additional traffic to use Avenue Road would reduce the quality of the urban realm in Avenue Road and the development of a sense of place at Swiss Cottage, which is a major benefit of the scheme as proposed.

Cycling provision around the gyratory

Some respondents called for new cycle lanes or tracks to be installed around the gyratory in order to maintain the one-way motor traffic layout and reduce any potential impacts on motor traffic.

As noted above, a number of options for Swiss Cottage were considered when the scheme was first proposed, including different variations of full or partial gyratory removal. We and our borough partners assessed various options against their benefits and dis-benefits for different road users. The possibility of retaining the gyratory and providing cycle lanes on all arms of the Swiss Cottage triangle was considered at this stage. Providing cycle lanes on all arms would reduce the road space available for motor traffic. In addition, separate signals for cyclists or banned movements for motor traffic would be required at junctions to remove conflict with vehicles. This would lead to complex junction layouts and would be likely to have a significant impact on journey times and traffic reassignment onto local roads. This option would also make it impossible to provide the benefits to the pedestrian environment which are proposed for Swiss Cottage, including the new public space outside the library, expanded footways outside Swiss Cottage Underground Station, and the new avenue of trees.

Journey times for east-west motorists, including the impact of HS2

Some respondents expressed concern that increased queueing and proposed HS2 road closures on Adelaide Road would restrict east-west journeys through the area.

The CS11 proposals are predicted to lead to an increase in journey times for vehicles travelling in the east-west direction, and this was made clear in the information provided during consultation showing predicted journey times for different types of road user. Since the close of consultation, we have been working with stakeholders to address the concerns that were raised, and we have made some changes to the proposals in order to reduce the amount of traffic reassigning from main roads into minor roads. Traffic modelling of these changes suggests that journey times on Adelaide Road are likely to increase more than they were expected to increase under the original proposals for the scheme, though this increase will primarily impact eastbound journeys rather than westbound journeys as we originally proposed. Because of this, we will be looking into whether it is possible to design the junction so that the right turn from Finchley Road into Hilgrove Road could be banned on a part-time basis. Vehicles would be able to make this turn most of the time, but the turn could be banned at the busiest times. This dynamic use of road space would help us to strike the best balance between the needs of different road users. See [Appendix A](#) for the update traffic modelling information.

We understand there is concern about the impacts of HS2 works, and we have responded to broader issues around HS2 construction on [p15](#). If HS2 goes ahead, its works will most likely include the installation of a ventilation shaft, construction of which will affect Adelaide Road. HS2 has published some high-level information about what works will be required and when it expects them to take place. However, this information is advisory only, having been put together by HS2 in 2013 as part of the Hybrid Bill process, well in advance of HS2 being granted Royal Assent. At the time of writing, as far as we are aware, HS2 has not appointed a contractor to carry out its works, so any information it has published about what works are necessary, timescales, duration and impact is only an indicative estimate.

Only when HS2 has moved forward with its plans, will we be in a position to understand more detailed information about works on Adelaide Road. As soon as the required information becomes available, we will work closely with HS2 to ensure the potential impacts of both CS11 and HS2 are understood and that disruption is kept to a minimum.

Lane reduction at Swiss Cottage

Some respondents expressed concern about reducing the number of motor traffic lanes through Swiss Cottage from six to three as a result of making the roads two-way for general traffic.

We have responded to issues around the impact on general motor traffic in the section starting on [p17](#).

Thames Water works

Some respondents expressed concern that Thames Water works in the Swiss Cottage area had caused congestion previously.

We have responded to this issue on [p19](#).

Reassignment to Arkwright Road

Some respondents expressed concern about a potential increase in motor traffic in Arkwright Road as a result of the proposed banned turns in and out of College Crescent, and that this would require improved pedestrian crossing facilities at the junction with Finchley Road.

As explained in the [Summary of Changes](#), we have made a number of changes to the proposals in order to reduce the amount of traffic expected to divert into minor roads. In our original proposals, we had intended to ban the right turn from College Crescent into Finchley Road for all vehicles. We are now proposing to allow all vehicles to make this turn. Modelling suggests that allowing this turn would significantly reduce the amount of traffic reassigning into Arkwright Road.

Reassignment to Goldhurst Terrace, Fairfax Road and Belsize roundabout, and impact on Quietway 3

Some respondents expressed concern that a potential increase in motor traffic in Goldhurst Terrace, Fairfax Road and at the Belsize roundabout would have a detrimental impact in these residential streets and could affect the proposed [Quietway 3](#) cycle route between Regent's Park and Dollis Hill.

As explained in the [Summary of Changes](#), we have made a number of changes to the proposals in order to reduce the amount of traffic expected to divert into minor roads. In our original proposals, we had intended to ban the right turn from Finchley Road into Hilgrove Road for all vehicles. We now aim to allow all vehicles to make this turn, and traffic modelling suggests that this will reduce the amount of traffic reassigning onto Goldhurst Terrace, Fairfax Road and the Belsize roundabout. However, we will be looking into whether it is possible to design the junction so that the right turn from Finchley Road into Hilgrove Road could be banned on a part-time basis. This dynamic use of road space would help us to manage traffic flows around Swiss Cottage and strike the best balance between the needs of different road users.

Proposals for Quietway 3 are still being developed by the London Borough of Camden and its design will take CS11 into account.

100 Avenue Road

Some respondents expressed concern that the CS11 proposals have not adequately taken into consideration the 100 Avenue Road proposals.

We have responded to this issue on [p16](#).

Banned turns into/out of College Crescent

Some respondents expressed concern about the proposed banned turns between College Crescent and Finchley Road.

We have changed the proposals in the light of feedback received during consultation and we are now proposing to allow all vehicles to make the right turn from College Crescent into Finchley Road (see the Summary of Changes for more details).

Banned right turn into Hilgrove Road from Finchley Road

Some respondents expressed concern about the proposed banned right turn for motor traffic from the A41 Finchley Road into Hilgrove Road, saying it would have negative impacts on journey times.

We have changed the proposals in the light of feedback during consultation and we are now proposing to allow all vehicles to make the turn from Finchley Road into Hilgrove Road (see the [Summary of Changes](#) for more details).

Allowing vehicles to make this movement is expected to increase journey times for general traffic and buses on Adelaide Road, particularly in the eastbound direction. Full updated modelling results can be found in [Appendix A](#). Because of this, we will be looking into whether it is possible to design the junction so that the right turn from Finchley Road into Hilgrove Road could be banned on a part-time basis. Vehicles would be able to make this turn most of the time, but the turn could be banned at the busiest times. This dynamic use of road space would help us to strike the best balance between the needs of different road users.

Impact on cycling

Cycling in St John's Wood Park

Some respondents requested that cyclists heading north on St John's Wood Park should be able to join CS11 at Swiss Cottage and continue north up Avenue Road. The existing configuration of this junction only allows vehicles and cyclists exiting St John's Wood Park to turn left, with the flow of the existing gyratory, and we retained a similar configuration to the junction in the proposals we consulted on.

In response to further investigation and feedback received during consultation, we will redesign the junction of St John's Wood Park and Adelaide Road to enable northbound cyclists to join CS11 more easily and continue north on Avenue Road. The changes will also preserve a tree at this location, which we had planned to

remove. Motor vehicles would still only be permitted to turn left from St John's Wood Park into Adelaide Road, as in the existing layout.

Cycling in Finchley Road

Some respondents expressed concern at the lack of protected cycling provision in Finchley Road north of Swiss Cottage.

We do not currently have any proposals for an extension of the CS11 route north towards Brent Cross. We are satisfied the CS11 route that we consulted on from Swiss Cottage to Portland Place will operate successfully and will be a useful contribution to the cycle network, irrespective of whether there is any route extension north of Swiss Cottage. We will continue to examine the options for continuing the route further north.

At present, cyclists on Finchley Road benefit from the presence of a bus lane at the busiest times of the day. We continue to progress proposals for Quietways which provide alternative routes, for example Quietway 3 which offers a route from Gladstone Park to Regent's Park.

Southbound cycle track from Finchley Road to Avenue Road

Some respondents called for the southbound cycle track from Finchley Road to Avenue Road to be located next to the kerb, with bus stop bypasses where appropriate. Some respondents felt that this would improve the safety of cyclists crossing from Finchley Road to Avenue Road.

We propose retaining the existing design, which locates the cycle lane on the offside, to the right of the bus lane in both the north and southbound direction.

Cyclists heading south from Finchley Road are likely to be on the offside as they pass bus stop B. We have provided a central feeder lane to the Advanced Stop Line (ASL) to guide cyclists to stay in the middle of the lane. This feeder lane was proposed to be 1.5 metres wide, but following feedback we are going to widen it to 2 metres to give cyclists more space and a greater sense of security. After the junction, road markings guide them south into the offside cycle lane. This arrangement prevents cyclists from having to swing in to the left again as soon as they have passed bus stop B, potentially causing conflict.

We initially proposed to ban the left turn at this junction for all motor traffic. However, following feedback, we are now proposing to allow the left turn for local buses only in order to reduce bus journey times. This movement is only made by one bus route, the 268, which operates with a frequency of around four buses per hour at peak times. All other bus routes will continue south down Avenue Road. Encouraging cyclists to remain on the offside and keeping the cycle track to the right of the bus lane on Avenue Road reduces the risk of conflict between cyclists and left-turning buses at this location.

Locating the cycle track to the right of the bus lane also removes the need for bus-stop bypasses, providing improved continuity of space for pedestrians moving between the bus stops and the library and leisure centre. Cyclists will benefit from an unimpeded cycle track with greater priority and less potential for conflict with pedestrians.

The provision of an area of raised carriageway in the centre of Avenue Road between the bus stops will mean cyclists will be able to get from the cycle track to the library and leisure centre. There will be no kerb segregation at this location and general traffic will not be permitted on this section of Avenue Road, meaning traffic flows will be low, at around 56 buses per hour.

Cycle track in Avenue Road

Some respondents called for the cycle tracks along Avenue Road, north of Adelaide Road, to be made wider than the proposed 2 metres to conform to the London Cycle Design Standard (LCDS) recommended widths for higher-traffic cycle routes, which are 2.2 to 2.5 metres. It was claimed there is adequate space along this road to accommodate wider tracks.

We have proposed to change the design to make the cycle track stepped rather than kerb segregated. This provides cyclists with an equal level of protection, with the advantage that the space previously taken by the segregation kerb would be flush with the track to effectively widen the space available to cyclists. This layout would also make it easier for cyclists to leave the cycle track to access buildings or facilities on the footway.

Making the cycle track stepped enables us to provide cyclists with more space while continuing to provide a minimum 3 metres wide bus lane in both directions, avoiding cutbacks to the footway and allowing us to provide a central island of 3.5 metres. The central island is intended to provide enough space for the avenue of trees to consist of larger tree species that need greater root space (subject to further investigations).

Cycling in Adelaide Road

Some respondents expressed concern that, while north-south cycling through Swiss Cottage was catered for, the scheme will not provide safe passage for east-west cyclists, such as those using Adelaide Road. There were calls for protected cycle tracks and two-stage right turns to allow safer and more comfortable east-west cycling journeys and access to CS11.

Our feasibility studies identified Swiss Cottage gyratory as a major barrier to cycling, with most journeys being north-south. It was not possible to provide cycle lanes or separate signals on Adelaide Road owing to capacity constraints and the need to minimise journey time impacts for buses and general traffic on Adelaide Road under the current proposals. For cyclists travelling east-west through Swiss Cottage, an

area of shared space links Eton Avenue to the toucan crossing outside Swiss Cottage tube station, enabling cyclists to access Belsize Road to continue their journey. CS11 will also form part of a wider cycling network, with links to other cycle routes at a number of locations.

Banned turns open to cycles

Some respondents called for the banned turns at College Crescent and Hilgrove Road to remain open to cycle traffic.

We are now proposing to allow all vehicles, including cyclists, to make the right turn from College Crescent into Finchley Road and the right turn from Finchley Road into Hillgrove Road (see [p20](#)). We have also adjusted the proposals to allow buses and cyclists only to make the left turn from Finchley Road into College Crescent.

Elsewhere on the route where traffic movements are restricted, cyclists will be permitted to make the movement wherever it is safe to do so. For instance, at the junction between Adelaide Road and Adelaide Road, northbound motor vehicles will only be able to turn left (as they must at present). However, as a separate cycle signal is provided, cyclists at this location will be able to go in any direction, including straight ahead and right.

Signals to favour cycling

Some respondents called for the timings of signalised crossings and traffic light phases to provide swift passage for cyclists using CS11.

We recognise the need to provide fast and direct journeys for cycling to make it attractive to more people. When implementing any traffic signal timings, we aim to reduce delay to cyclists as much as possible while also providing an appropriate balance between cyclists and other road users such as buses, general traffic and pedestrians. Once the scheme is in place, we will look at how the scheme is operating, and use this information to further refine any traffic signals as necessary.

Particular attention was drawn to the signals on the Outer Circle of Regent's Park. The popularity of the Outer Circle with cyclists doing training laps means that when cyclists stop at signals large groups can often form, which is not desirable from the cyclists' perspective and can be intimidating to other park users. We will review the signal timings at lights around the park to see whether any changes are possible to reduce the likelihood of large groups of cyclists forming when they stop at signals.

Cycle Hire docking stations

Some respondents called for more Santander Cycles docking stations along in the Swiss Cottage area.

We have responded to this issue on [p36](#).

Buses in Avenue Road

Some respondents expressed concern about potential conflict as a result of southbound buses and two-way cycle traffic using the northern section of Avenue Road.

As well as the removal of general motor traffic, this section of CS11 will include stepped segregated cycle tracks to separate northbound and southbound cyclists from southbound buses. In addition, any northbound traffic accessing the underground car park by the Odeon Cinema will also be kerb-separated from cycling movements. Northbound cyclists coming from Avenue Road south will have a separate signal to general traffic. Separate signals and segregated cycle lanes are expected to significantly reduce the possibility of conflict between cyclists and other vehicles on Avenue Road. Overall, we expect the new road layout to provide quicker, safer, quieter and more comfortable journeys for cyclists.

Impact on pedestrians

Avenue Road public realm

Some respondents expressed concern that the proposed improved pedestrian environment between Ye Olde Swiss Cottage pub and the Odeon Cinema and Swiss Cottage Library would not provide adequate amenity for pedestrians.

Our scheme will remove general traffic from this location, create a pedestrian-friendly area between existing amenities east and west of Avenue Road, and introduce trees and a more attractive pedestrian environment. The only traffic in this area will be north-south cycles and approximately 56 southbound buses per hour. As such, the area will be quieter, less polluted and offer road safety benefits compared with its current layout. We are satisfied that the changes will create a major improvement in the pedestrian environment.

Toucan crossings

Some respondents raised concerns over pedestrian and cycle conflict at the proposed toucan (shared cycle and pedestrian) crossing, including potential difficulties for those with visual impairments.

We have proposed a signal-controlled toucan crossing with tactile paving to guide visually impaired people to the push button. The crossing will be 8 metres wide to reduce the likelihood of conflict between cyclists and pedestrians. This crossing conforms to design guidance laid out in Local Transport Note 2/95 'The Design of Pedestrian Crossings' (Department for Transport) and we are satisfied that it provides adequate space for safe use by visually impaired people.

Straight-across crossings

Some respondents expressed concern about the introduction of staggered pedestrian crossings, which require pedestrians to cross in two stages, instead of single-stage straight-across crossings.

We recognise that straight-across crossings are preferred by many people. While it has not always been possible to provide straight crossings, we have simplified pedestrian crossing movements wherever possible. For example, some crossings currently require pedestrians to navigate complex, staggered arrangements involving three or more crossing stages. We are proposing to convert these into simpler, two-stage crossings. We have also proposed new crossings at certain locations where there are currently no crossing facilities. A summary of the pedestrian crossing improvements at Swiss Cottage is provided below.

New crossings:

- Across Adelaide Road, on the western arm of the junction with Avenue Road
- Across Finchley Road, on the northern arm of the junction with Hilgrove Road and Adelaide Road

Simplified crossings:

- Across the eastern, southern and western arms of the junction of Finchley Road, Hilgrove Road and Adelaide Road (three-stage crossings become two-stage)
- Across Finchley Road, at the junction with College Crescent (three-stage staggered pedestrian crossing becomes a straight two-stage toucan crossing)
- Across the eastern arm of the junction of Avenue Road and Adelaide Road (three-stage crossing becomes a straight single-stage crossing)
- Across the southern arm of the junction of Avenue Road and Adelaide Road (three-stage crossing becomes a straight, single stage crossing)
- Across College Crescent, at the junction with Finchley Road (two-stage staggered crossing becomes a two-stage straight crossing)

We are satisfied that our scheme will substantially improve the pedestrian accessibility in the Swiss Cottage area. We have prioritised straight-across pedestrian crossings wherever possible, and introduced crossings where there was previously no crossing facility. However, it is not always possible to introduce straight-across crossings universally, without significant impacts on traffic congestion and journey times. We are confident we have achieved a satisfactory balance between the different road user needs.

Impact on people with disabilities

Crossing Avenue Road

Some respondents expressed concern that visually impaired people would not be able to safely cross the new shared space on Avenue Road, north of Adelaide Road, between the cinema and the library.

We have proposed several changes to the design to make it easier for visually impaired people to navigate this space. The area will still be raised to footway level but will not act as shared space. Instead, it will effectively act as an unsignalised pedestrian crossing, but with careful use of materials to create a sense that it is a public space where mutual courtesy between different road users is expected.

To signal to visually impaired users where it is safe to wait, tactile paving will be added to the central island and the materials used in the carriageway and the cycle track will be continued through the raised area. The very low traffic volumes (approximately 56 buses per hour) will mean that all pedestrians should be able to cross easily.

Impact on buses

Congestion and journey times

Some respondents expressed concern about the impact of CS11 on bus journey times.

See the section on the impact on general motor traffic starting on [p17](#).

Bus stops in Avenue Road

Some respondents expressed concern about the loss of bus services from the stop outside the library in Avenue Road.

We accept that one of the outcomes of making the Swiss Cottage gyratory two-way is that route 31 will be no longer stop directly outside the library due to being able to continue eastbound journeys without going around the one-way system. With that in mind, we have created a new bus stop south of the library and the leisure centre. We accept that this will mean a walk of between 100 metres (to stop D) and 180 metres (to stop E) for those wanting to connect to services that stop outside the library, but consider this to be acceptable given the overall benefits of the scheme.

Impact on taxis

Taxi ranks

Some respondents called for a taxi rank to be provided near the Swiss Cottage library and leisure centre.

We originally proposed a new taxi rank to be located on the eastern side of Finchley Road next to Swiss Cottage Underground station. Due to concerns about the use of Finchley Road by HGVs with abnormal loads we are now proposing to locate this new taxi rank on the eastern side of College Crescent, near bus stop G. This taxi rank will be operational overnight between 11pm and 6am to tie in with the Night Tube services on the Jubilee Line, and allow public transport users to make onward journeys by taxi. It will be located just 75 metres from the nearest Underground exit, near the extended pedestrian footway next to Eton Avenue and near key trip attractors such as the Hampstead Theatre.

Taxi rank near Swiss Cottage station

Some respondents called for a taxi rank to be provided near the Swiss Cottage library and leisure centre. In order to keep motor traffic on Avenue Road through Swiss Cottage to a minimum and make the pedestrian environment as pleasant as possible, we are not proposing to allow taxis to use Avenue Road through Swiss Cottage, and therefore have not included a taxi rank at this location.

The taxi rank on the eastern side of Finchley Road outside Swiss Cottage Underground station will now be located on the eastern side of College Crescent (see above).

Impact on parking and loading

Odeon Cinema

Some respondents expressed concern about the removal of the loading and disabled parking bay by the Odeon Cinema, saying it reduced access to local amenities.

We are proposing to remove the existing loading and disabled bay south of the cinema because there is insufficient footway width to inset the bay and parking on the carriageway would impact capacity at the Finchley Road / Hilgrove Road junction.

However, we are proposing to provide a 6 metre long disabled parking bay and a 12 metre long loading bay outside the Odeon cinema, both set into the footway, so there will still be provision for disabled parking and loading for local businesses.

Based on feedback from the consultation, we will be reviewing the proposals for loading at Swiss Cottage. We will carry out further engagement with local businesses and the borough, and investigate options for re-timing deliveries outside of peak hours which will feed into the decision making process.

Parking and loading in Harben Parade

Some respondents expressed concern about changes to loading and disabled parking on Harben Parade (the southern section of Finchley Road where it meets College Crescent).

This section of Finchley Road is a busy area with lots of shops and other businesses. Based on feedback from the consultation, we will be reviewing the plans for loading and disabled parking bays at Swiss Cottage. We will carry out further engagement with local businesses and the borough, and investigate options for re-timing deliveries outside of peak hours which will feed into the decision making process.

Environmental impact

Pollution

Some respondents expressed concern about the impact on air pollution.

We have responded to this issue on [p33](#).

Planting and trees

Some respondents called for additional trees to be planted in the Swiss Cottage area.

As part of the major reconfiguration of traffic movements in the Swiss Cottage area, we proposed to remove six trees, mainly from traffic islands that are no longer necessary when the one-way system is removed. We recognise that trees have an important role to play in any urban environment, in making an area look better and helping to improve air quality. Successful tree-planting depends on a range of conditions, including the suitability of the ground to sustain the tree. It is often not possible to plant trees because of key services located in the footways, such as telecommunications, gas and water.

We have reviewed the proposed layout of the junction between St John's Wood Park and Adelaide Road, and made some changes which mean we now do not expect to have to remove the tree at that location.

We want to plant as many new trees as possible at Swiss Cottage to make it a more pleasant place to be. We are confident that we will be able to replace the five trees

that we will have to remove, and we expect to be able to plant many more trees than that. We identified locations where we believe at least XX trees could be planted and these were shown on our consultation plans including a new avenue of trees along the new bus-cycle-pedestrian only section of Avenue Road where we hope to be able to plant large tree species. Until we have carried out a thorough investigation into ground conditions by digging trial holes, we cannot say for certain how many trees we will be able to plant, but we commit to planting as many as possible along the length of the route.

Impact on business

Congestion

Some respondents expressed concern that CS11 would have a negative impact on motor traffic, which would affect businesses.

Please see our responses to concerns about the impact on general motor traffic starting on [p17](#).

Parking and loading

Some respondents expressed concern about how changes to parking and loading would affect businesses.

Please see the section on parking and loading on [p57](#).

Sections 2 & 3: Avenue Road (north & south)

Avenue Road north of Norfolk Road (as far as Adelaide Road) is managed by the London Borough of Camden, while Avenue Road south of Norfolk Road is a borough boundary road, controlled by Westminster City Council. We worked closely with the local authorities in Camden and Westminster to design CS11 on their sections of Avenue Road.

We presented these two sections separately on our consultation website, and asked separate questions about people's views on them. However, the issues raised for both were very similar, so we have collated our responses to those issues raised into a single chapter, with input from the London Borough of Camden and Westminster City Council.

Impact on cycling

Avenue Road is safe already

Some respondents claimed that existing cycling provision along Avenue Road (south of Adelaide Road) is adequate, and further interventions are not necessary.

Currently, this section of Avenue Road is used by significant volumes of motor traffic, particularly southbound, because the one-way system encourages motorists to follow this route south towards the West End. The only cycling provisions are advisory cycle lanes varying in width between 1.2 metres and 1.5 metres which are sometimes blocked by parked vehicles. In addition, the staggered junction of Avenue Road with Elsworthy Road and Queen's Grove has a high collision rate for a junction of this type. The collision history of the junction shows that cyclists and motorcyclists are particularly at risk, with five collisions at this location involving a motorist and a cyclist or a motorcyclist in the 36 months up to October 2015 (the latest information available at the time of requesting). One of these injuries was serious, while the other four were minor.

The low standard of current provision, the high volumes of southbound motor traffic, and the high collision rate at the Queen's Park / Elsworthy Road junction mean that this section of the route does not currently reach the standard required for a Cycle Superhighway. As such, further interventions are necessary in order to turn it into a route that is safe and comfortable for everyone to cycle.

Kerbed/stepped cycle lanes

Some respondents requested that the cycle lanes on Avenue Road, south of Adelaide Road, are segregated using either kerbed or stepped tracks.

We support the use of segregation where possible, but this is not practical or appropriate for all roads in London. In Avenue Road, north of Adelaide Road, we will

implement segregated tracks where the space allows. In Avenue Road south of Adelaide Road there is not enough space to accommodate 2 metre wide segregated tracks while retaining a lane for general traffic in each direction. The only way to accommodate these would be to cut back the footway, which would involve removing a very large number of mature trees, which are an essential part of the neighbourhood.

We plan to improve the existing cycle lanes by providing a consistent 1.5m width throughout, as well as upgrading from advisory to mandatory lanes and making changes to parking and loading arrangements to ensure these will be clear for cyclists. Our traffic modelling suggests that the removal of the Swiss Cottage one-way system would mean that Avenue Road would experience less motor traffic during the busiest periods, making it safer and more comfortable for cyclists and pedestrians alike. We are satisfied that our proposals will offer a good level of service for cycling.

Enforcement of mandatory lanes

Some respondents expressed concern that mandatory lanes are often blocked by illegally parked vehicles, calling for greater enforcement.

Currently, parking regulations in Avenue Road allow vehicles to park in the advisory cycle lanes at certain times of day. By moving some parking bays onto the footway and changing restrictions to double yellow lines with no waiting or loading allowed at any time we will provide clear passage for cycling at all times.

We are aware that vehicles sometimes stop illegally in mandatory cycle lanes and violate parking restrictions elsewhere. The restrictions we put in place will be enforced in the usual way by borough parking authorities.

Wider cycle lanes

Some respondents called for the cycle lanes on Avenue Road to be wider than 1.5 metres to allow faster cyclists to overtake slower ones.

It is not possible to provide cycle lanes wider than 1.5 metres while retaining a 3 metre lane for traffic in each direction. These proposals will enhance the existing cycle lane and offer more protection for cyclists travelling on Avenue Road, particularly when allied to the other measures that are being implemented. Cyclists will be able to overtake other cyclists with care by using the general traffic lane.

Sightlines in Avenue Road

Some respondents expressed concern that the mature trees in Avenue Road interrupt sightlines, increasing risk to cyclists, particularly from collisions with drivers entering from side roads.

CS11 designs are subject to a rigorous multi-stage Road Safety Audit (RSA) process during development. The RSA is carried out to ensure due consideration is given to the effects of any proposal on all road users and especially vulnerable user groups such as the very young, elderly people, people with disabilities, and – more generally – pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists. Sightlines and their effect on the safety of road users are considered during the RSA process.

In addition, once CS11 has been implemented, we will continue to monitor the route (as we do for all Cycle Superhighways) in order to assess whether any additional measures are necessary to improve safety.

Lighting in Avenue Road

Some respondents expressed concern that the mature trees in Avenue Road make the road unusually dark, increasing risk to cycling.

As part of the detailed design process, we will carry out lighting surveys to ensure there are adequate light levels along Avenue Road. If necessary, we will upgrade the lighting and adjust any tree-pruning to ensure there are adequate light levels to maintain safety. Avenue Road is a borough road, and we will work with the London Borough of Camden and Westminster City Council on this aspect of road maintenance.

Remove motor traffic

Some respondents called for all motor traffic or through motor traffic to be removed from the entirety of Avenue Road to improve cycling safety.

Avenue Road is a residential road, and it would not be desirable or practical to ban motor traffic along the section south of Adelaide Road. We are satisfied that the interventions planned as part of CS11 will reduce the volume of motor traffic during the busiest periods on this section of Avenue Road and provide improved cycling provision in the form of mandatory cycle lanes (where there are currently advisory lanes). As we do for all Cycle Superhighways, we will continue to monitor Avenue Road once CS11 is in place in order to ascertain whether any additional measures are necessary to ensure the safety of all road users.

Any proposals to remove through motor traffic on this section of Avenue Road (as opposed to banning all motor traffic) would have to be brought forward in conjunction with the London Borough of Camden and Westminster City Council, and there are no plans to do so.

Design of raised junctions

Some respondents expressed concern that the design of the raised sections of carriageway might not be safe or comfortable for cycling.

Avenue Road currently has several sections where the carriageway has been raised to footway level at junctions or crossings and we are not aware of any safety risks caused by these existing raised junctions. The heritage considerations that would require the use of appropriate materials in The Regent's Park are not applicable to Avenue Road, so a standard tarmac finish would be applied to ensure a comfortable transition over the raised area.

We will ensure that all raised sections of carriageway are safe and comfortable for cycling and new raised sections will be designed in accordance with London Cycling Design Standards.

Impact on motor traffic

Closing Avenue Road

Some respondents expressed concern that we planned to close this part of Avenue Road to motor traffic. We did not propose this, and this appears to have been a result of respondents misunderstanding the scheme.

Thames Water works

Some respondents expressed concern about Thames Water works in this area previously causing congestion.

We have responded to this issue on [p19](#).

Closure of Queen's Grove

Some respondents expressed concern that the proposed closure of the junction of Queen's Grove and Avenue Road would reassign motor traffic to local roads such as Acacia Road and Norfolk Road.

We proposed restricting access between Queen's Grove and Avenue Road as this is a collision hotspot for cyclists. Five out of six collisions which occurred at this junction over the past three years involved cyclists. The London Borough of Camden has previously attempted to improve safety at the junction by raising it to footway level in order to slow vehicles. This work was carried out in 2010, but has not been successful in reducing the rate of collisions.

We and the London Borough of Camden carried out a feasibility study into the possibility of adding signals at this junction in 2009. This study concluded that signals would not be advisable here due to the nearby presence of several driveways giving access to private property. These driveways would fall inside the geometry of the junction if it were signalised, creating conflict with vehicles moving through the junction on a green signal, expecting a clear path, and drivers accessing those driveways.

We accept that some vehicles might choose to use Acacia Road or Norfolk Road instead of Queen's Grove. However, because these roads are less direct (they do not offer the simple east-west route into Elsworthy Road), we expect the majority of drivers will choose to remain on Finchley Road and use Adelaide Road to head east. At the moment, it is not possible to travel eastbound on Adelaide Road from Finchley Road due to the Swiss Cottage one-way system. When Adelaide Road becomes two-way, drivers will have an alternative to the Queen's Grove / Elsworthy route. Enabling motor traffic to use a main road like Adelaide Road rather than a minor road like Queen's Grove helps to reduce the amount of motor traffic using minor roads.

If some drivers do choose to use Norfolk Road or Acacia Road as an alternative to the newly closed Queen's Grove, this route would present less of a risk to cycling than the current movement between Queen's Grove and Elsworthy Road. This is because drivers using these alternative roads would only need to make a simple left turn to reach Elsworthy Road to continue their journey. This simple left turn presents much less of a risk than the 'dog-leg' movement currently required to continue east from Queen's Grove into Elsworthy Road.

We will monitor traffic flows following the implementation of the scheme and we will work with Camden and Westminster councils to address any detrimental impact on Acacia Road and Norfolk Road.

Emergency vehicle movements

Some respondents expressed concern that the proposed closure of the the junction of Queen's Grove and Avenue Road would close an essential route for emergency vehicles

The closure in Queen's Grove will be implemented using a removable bollard, which will allow emergency vehicles to pass through the junction. This approach has been taken on other schemes in London where access restrictions have been proposed. We will continue to work with the emergency services to allow them to feed into our proposals going forward.

Parents and the 'school run'

Some respondents expressed concern that CS11 would affect journeys to schools in the area.

See the section on the impact on general motor traffic on [p21](#).

Business transport / deliveries

Some respondents expressed concern that CS11 would affect business journeys and transport in the area.

See the section on the impact on general motor traffic on [p19](#).

Impact on bus passengers

Buses along Avenue Road

Some respondents expressed concern that we planned to route buses along this section of Avenue Road.

We did not propose this, and this appears to have been a result of respondents misunderstanding the proposals. At the moment, no bus routes use Avenue Road south of Swiss Cottage and there are no plans to change this as part of CS11.

Impact on parking

Visiting properties

Some respondents expressed concern at the proposed changes to parking restrictions, which they said would make it more difficult for people to visit their properties.

The new parking restrictions are being introduced to improve cycling safety, particularly during peak hours. Before putting these proposals forward, the London Borough of Camden and Westminster City Council carried out parking and loading surveys on Avenue Road. These studies showed that a reorganisation of parking and loading in this area was possible.

Impact on environment

Air pollution

Some respondents expressed concern about the impact on air pollution

We have responded to this issue on [p33](#).

Impact on taxis

Taxis on Avenue Road

Some respondents expressed concern that we planned to ban taxis from this section of Avenue Road.

We did not propose this measure, and this appears to have been a result of respondents misunderstanding the proposals. Taxis will continue to be able to use Avenue Road from Adelaide Road south.

Impact on road safety

Additional traffic-calming

Some respondents called for additional traffic-calming measures on Avenue Road.

There are three existing raised tables on this stretch of Avenue Road, and two more will be added as part of the CS11 proposals. Having worked closely with the London Borough of Camden and Westminster City Council, we are satisfied that the proposed interventions will provide a satisfactory level of service to users of CS11.

As we do for all Cycle Superhighways, we will continue to monitor Avenue Road once CS11 is in place in order to ascertain whether any additional measures are necessary to improve safety for all road users.

20mph

Some respondents called for a 20mph speed limit on Avenue Road.

The section of Avenue Road between Norfolk Road and Adelaide Road lies in Camden and already has a 20mph speed limit, in line with the London Borough of Camden's borough-wide policy. The southern half of Avenue Road is controlled by Westminster City Council, and the speed limit is currently 30mph.

Westminster City Council is currently updating its policy on 20mph and is considering trials of 20mph speed limits in selected areas.. However, we are satisfied that the proposed interventions will provide a satisfactory level of safety to cyclists using CS11 and we are not proposing to introduce a 20mph speed limit on the section of Avenue Road south of Norfolk Road as part of the CS11 proposals.

As we do for all Cycle Superhighways, we will continue to monitor Avenue Road once CS11 is in place in order to ascertain whether any additional measures, including 20mph, are necessary to improve safety for all road users.

Section 4: The Regent's Park

The objectives for this section of the route were to make The Regent's Park a safer and more attractive environment more in keeping with its original design, and in particular to improve the safety and comfort of pedestrians and cyclists.

We asked people to give their opinions on four different measures proposed for the park: extra signage to alert drivers to their speed; the use of speed cameras; raised junctions at four locations and access restrictions at four of the gates into the park.

We received many views and suggestions about this area of the CS11 proposals. Many respondents were concerned about the impacts that our proposals to restrict access into the park through some of the gates would have on motor traffic. Other respondents were concerned about the impacts that the proposed use of raised tables on the Outer Circle would have on cyclists.

As a result of this feedback we will continue discussions with The Royal Parks and the Crown Estate Paving Commission to establish how improvements could be made for both cyclists and pedestrians.

Introducing limited access restrictions at some of the gates into the park and raised junctions at some locations around the park still remains a likely part of the solution. We would aim to complete the bulk of the work on the Swiss Cottage section of CS11 before any measures in The Regent's Park were implemented. This allows us to take further time to explore whether there are any alternative options which might deliver the same objectives for cyclists and pedestrians equally as well as the current proposals. To allow time for discussion and exploration of alternative measures, we will announce a way forward for this aspect of the CS11 scheme by summer 2017.

In the meantime, a reduction in the speed of motor vehicles using The Regent's Park will be an essential feature of any set of future measures, so we will immediately begin work in conjunction with The Royal Parks to explore whether a 20mph speed limit could be introduced for the whole of the park. While this work is ongoing, we will introduce a number of vehicle-activated illuminated signs to make drivers more aware of the existing 30mph speed limit.

Section 5: Park Crescent and Portland Place (Devonshire Street) and Section 6: Portland Place (Weymouth Street and New Cavendish Street)

We presented these two sections separately in our consultation materials, and asked separate questions about people's views on them. However, the issues raised for both were very similar, so we have collated our responses to those issues raised into a single chapter.

Park Crescent and Portland Place are managed by Westminster City Council. We worked closely with the local authority in Westminster to design this section of CS11.

Impact on cycling

Segregated cycling in Park Crescent

Some respondents called for segregated cycling provision in Park Crescent, potentially accommodated by the removal of some non-residents' parking bays.

We will progress Option B for segregated cycle lanes on Portland Place, subject to additional modelling. We will work with Westminster City Council to investigate whether this segregation can also be extended into Park Crescent.

Wider cycle lanes

Some respondents called for cycle lanes to be made wider.

We have proposed that the separated cycle lanes on Portland Place would be 1.5 metres wide, with a 1 metre wide buffer zone provided between the cycle track and the parked cars. The buffer zone is likely to take the form of a coloured strip, flush with the carriageway, rather than the kerb segregation seen on other cycle superhighways. This arrangement has the advantage of providing a full buffer zone to reduce the risks of cyclists being hit by a car door being opened, and gives people getting out of parked cars a full 1 metre space in which to alight before crossing the cycle track. However, at times when parking is not in use, cyclists would be able to use all the available space.

We will continue to review this design as we take the scheme through modelling to see whether further improvements are possible.

Segregation at junctions

Some respondents called for greater segregation of cyclists at junctions, with calls for safer junctions with Park Crescent and Marylebone Road.

At the junction between Park Crescent West and Marylebone Road, northbound cyclists would proceed under a separate signal to general traffic. At the junction between Park Crescent East and Marylebone Road, we have proposed to ban the left turn to all traffic, thereby significantly reducing the potential for conflict between cyclists and motor vehicles. We have also proposed a two-stage right turn here for cyclists.

Arrangements for cyclists continuing south from Park Square West or Park Square East will depend on the measures agreed for The Regent's Park. This aspect of the proposals will be reviewed once a decision on this has been made by summer 2017.

Vehicles parking in cycle lanes

Some respondents expressed concern about the use of advisory cycle lanes because of the likelihood of them being blocked by parked motor vehicles.

We are planning to progress with Option B, which proposed separated cycle lanes with the cycle lane located next to the kerb and the parking moved out to accommodate this, rather than Option A which proposed advisory cycle lanes only. Under this option it is unlikely that vehicles would park in a way which blocks the cycle lane.

Stepped cycle tracks

Some respondents called for the use of stepped cycle tracks in order to maximise the available width of the cycling provision, avoiding the need for kerbs.

The option which we will be taking forward, Option B, includes the provision of separated cycle lanes on Portland Place. We have not proposed kerb segregation at this location. Instead, a buffer zone will be provided which will be flush with carriageway level. This buffer zone will reduce the risk of cyclists being hit by car doors and gives people getting out of parked cars a full 1m space in which to alight before crossing the cycle track.

Cycling priority at side roads

Some respondents called for priority for cycling at side roads such as Weymouth Street and New Cavendish Street.

We currently do not have plans to provide separate signals for cyclists on these side roads. However, Westminster are currently working on plans for a Cycle Quietway route from Bayswater to Fitzrovia which would provide contra-flow cycle facilities along New Cavendish Street, and a Quietway cycle route that would provide improved cycle facilities on Devonshire Street.

Extend cycle route southwards

Some respondents called for CS11 to be extended south to link with the East-West Cycle Superhighway, and other major cycle routes.

We propose to end CS11 at the junction with New Cavendish Street, where it will link up with the proposed Quietway, which would provide an east-west link. The Mayor has been clear about his intention to continue investing in cycling and in the Cycle Superhighway programme. In the long term, we hope to create a comprehensive network of cycle routes throughout London, including Quietways, the Central London Grid and Cycle Superhighways.

Parking on cycle lanes

Some respondents expressed concern about double parking in Portland Place, particularly during the school run.

We have passed on this information to Westminster City Council who will raise the issue with their enforcement teams.

.

Impact on motor traffic

Congestion / reassignment to nearby roads

Some respondents expressed concern at the proposals, claiming the changes would cause motor traffic congestion in Portland Place, increasing journey times for motorists. Others felt the proposals would increase motor traffic in nearby roads such as Marylebone Road, Harley Street, Great Portland Street and Albany Street.

We have not yet completed comprehensive traffic modelling for this section of the route, as we consulted on two different options. Now we have selected an option to progress, we will proceed to fully model this to get a better understanding of the predicted impacts of the proposals are. We will work closely with Westminster City Council on this and the design may need to be revised or adjusted as this modelling progresses.

Impact on parking

Short-stay parking for the school run

Some respondents called for more short-stay parking to benefit parents dropping their children at schools in Portland Place.

We have not proposed the removal of any of the parking bays as part of the CS11 proposals. Portland Place already has parking on both sides of the street and on

both sides of the island in the centre of the road. This amounts two four rows of parking, significantly more than the average street is able to accommodate. It is unlikely that further parking provision could be safely provided within the geometry of the street.

Oppose removal of parking

Some respondents expressed concern at the proposed removal of some parking bays to accommodate improved cycling provision.

We have not proposed to remove any of the parking bays as part of the CS11 proposals. Some parking bays on Portland Place are proposed to be relocated elsewhere on Portland Place to ensure that the junctions can operate as efficiently as possible; however there is no change proposed to the overall number of parking bays.

Impact on pedestrians

Negative impact on pedestrians

Some respondents felt that the proposals would have a negative impact on pedestrians.

The option that we will be taking forward (Option B) includes seven new straight signalised pedestrian crossings on Portland Place, as well as one crossing that is currently in two stages but which would be made into a single-stage straight crossing. No footway reductions are proposed. We expect the changes in this area to be beneficial for pedestrians.

See [p53](#) for an explanation of the wider positive impacts of CS11 on pedestrian provision.

Impact on bus passengers

Bus boarder

Some respondents were concerned about a bus boarder being introduced in Portland Place.

As part of Option B, Westminster City Council has proposed to introduce a bus stop boarder at bus stop K on Portland Place. The bus boarder would have the cycle track running between the passenger waiting area and the road. Bus passengers would dismount from the bus into the cycle track and cyclists would be expected to give way to them. We recognise that this facility could introduce more interactions between cyclists and pedestrians. We will be working with Westminster City Council

to ensure the proposed bus stop boarder meets all necessary safety requirements and we will be informed by the experiences of other boroughs who have introduced this type of facility before progressing this proposal.

Appendix A: Updated traffic modelling information

Traffic modelling has been carried out to study the traffic impacts of the revised scheme during the busiest times of the day. The table below shows the original modelling results, which were published during the CS11 consultation, and the new results, which take into account the changes to the design outlined in this report.

We will be looking into whether it is possible to design the junction so that the right turn from Finchley Road into Hilgrove Road could be banned on a part-time basis. Vehicles would be able to make this turn most of the time, but the turn could be banned at the busiest times. Our assumption for the purposes of the traffic modelling below is that both turns will be allowed at all times. This is the worst-case scenario in terms of impact on motor traffic journey times. If we decide to change the design of the junction between Finchley Road and Hilgrove Road / Adelaide Road this, we will publish updated traffic modelling on our website.

We will not be making a decision about whether we will proceed with the proposal to restrict access at four of the eight gates into The Regent's Park during the busiest part of the day until summer 2017. In the meantime, we will be exploring other options for this section of the route. The traffic modelling assumes the access restrictions are in place and so represents a worst-case scenario in terms of impact on traffic reassignment. .

Results are presented for both the morning and evening peak hours. We will actively monitor and manage the road network following implementation to ensure impacts were balanced.

General note on modelling

It is important to note that our traffic reassignment modelling is only ever indicative; it is intended to give an idea of where the impacts of changes in journey choice are most likely to be felt. It assumes that drivers have perfect knowledge of the network and will always choose the quickest route available. The reassignment is a picture of what the network may look like once the on-street proposals and associated driver behaviour has had a chance to bed in.

We will actively monitor and manage traffic conditions on the roads following the delivery of the scheme, and we will aim to mitigate and manage traffic reassignment following implementation. We are investing in advanced traffic signal technology to allow us to better manage traffic depending on differing conditions at any given time, and we are working to improve road user information so people can make informed journey choices before they travel.

Swiss Cottage

The changes to the road layout predominately around Swiss cottage will lead to some traffic taking a different route. Some local roads are likely to see an increase in traffic because of our proposals, while other roads are predicted to see a reduction in traffic volumes.

As with the proposals consulted on, there is still likely to be reduced flow along Fitzjohn's Avenue leading into College Crescent, although as a result of the recommended changes this reduction is smaller than previously. We also expect to see a decrease in traffic on Parkhill Road in the morning peak. As a result of the changes we have made to the proposals, we no longer expect to see a significant increase in traffic on Heath Street, Rossllyn Hill, West Heath Road, Hampstead High Street or Arkwright Road. However, there is now likely to be an increase of traffic on Belsize Avenue and Belsize Park and also on Haverstock Hill towards Chalk Farm Underground station as the wider area impacted as a result of the proposals reduces

To the West of Swiss Cottage, we predicted an increase in traffic on Fairfax Road and Goldhurst Terrace under our original proposals. The updated modelling based on the revised proposals indicates that while there is still some increase in traffic on these roads, it has been significantly reduced.

Currently, the one-way system encourages southbound drivers to remain on Avenue Road south of Swiss Cottage towards The Regent's Park. Removing the one-way system changes driver choice and leads to a substantial drop in traffic on Avenue Road south of Swiss Cottage during both the morning and the evening peak, and this continues to be the case under the changed proposals. As part of this scheme, we are proposing to close Queen's Grove at its junction with Avenue Road to all traffic except cyclists, to reduce through traffic. This would lead to a reduction in traffic on Elsworthy Road eastbound and other local residential streets during both the morning and the evening peaks. A reduction in traffic is also likely on the minor roads between St John's Wood and Maida Vale.

The Regent's Park

As we have explained, we have not made a decision on whether to progress with access restrictions at The Regent's Park and will be taking some time to consider alternative options. However, because access restrictions remain a possibility, we have included them in the modelling to ensure that we represent the worst-case or most impactful scenario in our results. The updated modelling, therefore, shows a similar level of impact on roads around The Regent's Park to the modelling shown in our original consultation.

If you have any questions about changes to traffic flow on a particular road as a result of our proposals, please get in touch with us via trafficmodelling@tfl.gov.uk and we will do our best to answer your questions.

	Journeys Modelled	(A) Base Model Current situation on street 2015		(B) Original Future Scheme Expected situation on street 2016 with original scheme		(C) Difference between original future scheme (B) and base (A)		(D) Future Scheme post consultation changes: Expected situation on street 2016 with revised scheme		(E) Difference between revised scheme (D) and base (A)		
		AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	
Traffic Average journey times (minutes, expressed as a range)	Hendon Way to Baker Street	Southbound	36 to 38	21 to 23	26 to 28	19 to 21	-8 to -10	-1 to -2	34 to 36	23 to 25	-2 to -3	0 to 1
	Gloucester Place to Hendon Way	Northbound	14 to 16	20 to 22	15 to 17	21 to 23	0 to 1	1 to 2	15 to 17	21 to 23	1 to 2	-1 to 0
	Hilgrove Road to Adelaide Road	Eastbound	2 to 4	2 to 3	5 to 7	2 to 3	1 to 2	0 to 1	10 to 12	4 to 5	7 to 8	2 to 3
	Adelaide Road to Hilgrove Road	Westbound	2 to 3	1 to 2	5 to 7	2 to 3	4 to 5	0 to 1	2 to 3	4 to 5	0 to 1	3 to 4
Buses Journey times through the scheme area from bus s to p to bus s to p (minutes, expressed as a range)	Route 113 (between Gloucester Place to Hendon Way and Brent Cross Flyover to Baker Street)	Northbound towards Edgware Station	36 to 38	36 to 38	36 to 38	39 to 41	0 to 1	2 to 3	36 to 38	36 to 38	-1 to 0	0 to 1
		Southbound towards Marble Arch Station	50 to 52	39 to 41	40 to 42	39 to 41	-8 to -10	1 to 2	50 to 52	40 to 42	-1 to 0	1 to 2
	Route 82 & 13 (between Gloucester Place to Finchley Road & Finchley Road to Baker Street)	Northbound towards North Finchley (route 82) and Golders Green (route 13)	29 to 31	29 to 31	27 to 29	30 to 32	0 to 1	0 to 1	29 to 31	29 to 31	-2 to -1	-1 to 0
		Southbound towards Victoria bus station (route 82) and Aldwych (route 13)	38 to 40	32 to 34	31 to 33	33 to 35	-5 to -7	1 to 2	33 to 35	35 to 37	-2 to -1	3 to 4
	Route 102 & 226 (between the Vale to Pennine Drive & Pennine Drive to the Vale)	Westbound towards Brent Cross Shopping Centre (route 102) and Ealing Broadway station (route 266)	4 to 6	2 to 3	2 to 3	2 to 3	-2 to -3	0 to -1	4 to 6	4 to 5	1 to 2	2 to 3
		Eastbound towards Edmonton Green Bus Station (route 102) and Golders Green station (route 266)	2 to 3	2 to 3	2 to 3	2 to 3	0 to 1	0 to -1	2 to 3	2 to 3	-1 to 0	-1 to 0
	Route C11 (between Adelaide Road to Goldhurst Terrace & Canfield Gardens to Adelaide Road)	Northbound towards Brent Cross Shopping Centre	5 to 7	5 to 7	10 to 12	5 to 7	5 to 7	1 to 2	5 to 7	9 to 10	0 to 1	3 to 4
		Southbound towards Archway Station	9 to 11	5 to 7	7 to 9	6 to 7	0 to -2	1 to 2	10 to 12	8 to 9	2 to 3	2 to 3
	Route 245, 260 & 460 (between Cricklewood Lane East to Cricklewood Lane West & Cricklewood Lane West to Cricklewood Lane East)	Westbound towards Alperton Station (route 245), White City Bus Station (route 260) and Willesden Bus Garage (route 460)	1 to 2	1 to 2	1 to 2	2 to 3	0 to 1	1 to 2	1 to 2	1 to 2	0 to 1	0 to 1
		Eastbound towards Golders Green Station (route 245 and 260) and North Finchley Bus Station (route 460)	1 to 2	1 to 2	1 to 2	1 to 2	0 to 1	0 to -1	1 to 2	1 to 2	-1 to 0	0 to 1
	Route 46 (between Circus Road to College Crescent & College Crescent to Circus Road)	Northbound towards St Bartholomew's Hospital	7 to 9	7 to 9	7 to 9	7 to 9	0 to 1	0 to -1	7 to 9	12 to 14	-1 to 0	4 to 5
		Southbound towards Lancaster Gate Station	12 to 14	8 to 10	9 to 11	10 to 12	-2 to -3	1 to 2	17 to 19	9 to 11	5 to 6	1 to 2
	Route 31 (between Adelaide Road to Hilgrove Road & Hilgrove Road to Adelaide Road)	Westbound towards White City Bus Station	4 to 6	4 to 6	10 to 12	5 to 7	5 to 7	0 to 1	6 to 8	8 to 10	1 to 2	3 to 4
		Eastbound towards Camden Town Station	4 to 6	3 to 4	6 to 8	4 to 6	1 to 2	0 to 1	10 to 12	4 to 5	7 to 8	1 to 2
	Route 274 (between Gloucester Place to Prince Albert Road & Prince Albert Road to Baker Street)	Northbound towards Angel Islington	8 to 10	8 to 10	9 to 11	9 to 11	0 to 1	1 to 2	9 to 11	9 to 10	0 to 1	-1 to 0
		Southbound towards Lancaster Gate Station	11 to 13	10 to 12	10 to 12	10 to 12	-1 to -2	0 to -1	10 to 12	10 to 12	-2 to -1	-1 to 0
	Route 268 (between Sainsburys Access to College Crescent & College Crescent to Sainsburys Access)	Westbound towards the O2 Centre	10 to 12	9 to 11	10 to 12	9 to 11	0 to 1	1 to 2	10 to 12	7 to 8	-1 to 0	-3 to -2
		Eastbound towards Golders Green Station	7 to 9	7 to 9	9 to 11	9 to 11	3 to 4	1 to 2	9 to 11	5 to 7	3 to 4	-3 to -2
	Route 187 (between Circus Road to Sainsbury's Access & Sainsburys Access to Circus Road)	Northbound towards the O2 Centre	10 to 12	10 to 12	10 to 12	12 to 14	0 to 1	1 to 2	11 to 13	11 to 13	0 to 1	0 to 1
		Southbound towards Central Middlesex Hospital	17 to 19	14 to 16	12 to 14	14 to 16	-4 to -5	0 to -1	20 to 22	15 to 17	2 to 3	1 to 2
	Route 205, 27 & 453 (between Marylebone Road to Marylebone Road & Marylebone Road to Marylebone Road)	Westbound towards Paddington Station (route 205), Chiswick Business Park (route 27) and Great Central Street (route 453)	1 to 2	2 to 3	2 to 3	3 to 5	1 to 2	2 to 3	2 to 3	2 to 3	0 to 1	0 to 1
		Eastbound towards Bow Church Station (route 205), Chalk Farm (route 27) and Deptford Bridge (route 453)	2 to 3	2 to 3	2 to 3	2 to 3	0 to 1	0 to 1	2 to 3	2 to 3	0 to 1	0 to 1
	Route 74 (between Gloucester Place to Prince Albert Road & Alsop Place to Baker Street)	Northbound towards Baker Street Station	4 to 5	4 to 5	2 to 3	3 to 4	-1 to -2	0 to 1	3 to 4	3 to 4	-2 to -1	-1 to 0
		Southbound towards Putney Bridge Road	3 to 4	4 to 5	4 to 5	4 to 5	0 to 1	-1 to -2	3 to 4	4 to 5	-1 to 0	0 to 1
	Route 30 (between Gloucester Place to Marylebone Road East & Marylebone East to Baker Street)	Northbound towards Hackney Wick	4 to 5	3 to 4	2 to 3	3 to 4	-1 to -2	0 to 1	3 to 4	3 to 4	-2 to -1	-1 to 0
		Southbound towards Portman Street	1 to 2	1 to 2	2 to 3	2 to 3	1 to 2	1 to 2	1 to 2	4 to 5	-1 to 0	2 to 3
	Route 2 (between Gloucester Place to Dorset Square & Marylebone Road West to Baker Street)	Northbound towards Marylebone Station	2 to 3	2 to 3	2 to 3	2 to 3	0 to -1	0 to -1	2 to 3	1 to 2	-1 to 0	-1 to 0
		Southbound towards Norwood Bus Garage	2 to 3	4 to 5	2 to 3	2 to 3	0 to -1	-1 to -2	2 to 3	3 to 4	-1 to 0	-2 to -1
	Route 189 & 139 (between Gloucester Place to Rossmore Road & Rossmore Road to Baker Street)	Northbound towards Brent Cross Shopping Centre (route 189) and West End Green (route 139)	3 to 4	3 to 4	3 to 4	4 to 5	0 to 1	0 to 1	3 to 4	3 to 4	0 to 1	0 to 1
		Southbound towards Oxford Circus (route 189) and Waterloo Station (route 139)	5 to 6	4 to 5	4 to 5	4 to 5	0 to -1	0 to -1	5 to 6	4 to 5	-1 to 0	-1 to 0
	Route 328 (between Finchley Road to Fortune Green Road & Fortune Green Road to Finchley Road)	Southeast bound towards Chelsea Worlds End	2 to 3	3 to 4	3 to 4	3 to 4	0 to 1	0 to 1	3 to 4	3 to 4	0 to 1	0 to 1
		Northwest bound towards Golders Green Station	4 to 5	4 to 5	4 to 5	4 to 5	0 to -1	0 to -1	4 to 5	4 to 5	0 to 1	0 to 1
Cycling Average journey times (minutes, expressed as a range)	Hendon Way to Baker Street	Southbound	20 to 22	10 to 12	17 to 19	8 to 10	-3 to -4	-1 to -2	17 to 19	8 to 10	-3 to -4	0 to 1
	Gloucester Place to Hendon Way	Northbound	10 to 12	20 to 22	10 to 12	20 to 22	0 to 1	0 to 1	9 to 11	21 to 23	-1 to 0	0 to 1
	Adelaide Road to Hilgrove Road	Westbound	2 to 3	2 to 3	2 to 3	2 to 3	0 to 1	0 to 1	2 to 3	2 to 3	0 to 1	0 to 1
Pedestrians Traffic signal cycle times and associated wait times (seconds)	College Crescent	Max. cycle time	88	88	120	104	32	16	120	104	32	16
		Max. wait time	122	102	114	96	-8	-6	169	138	47	36
	Finchley Road and Avenue Road by College Crescent	Max. cycle time	88	88	120	104	32	16	120	104	32	16
		Max. wait time	130	157	164	129	34	-28	200	177	70	20
	Hilgrove Road	Max. cycle time	44	44	120	104	76	60	120	104	32	16
		Max. wait time	49	46	114	78	85	72	157	149	108	103
	Adelaide Road	Max. cycle time	44	44	120	104	76	60	120	104	32	16
		Max. wait time	69	66	154	138	87	83	180	141	111	75
	Finchley Road south of Hilgrove Road	Max. cycle time	44	44	120	104	76	60	120	104	32	16
		Max. wait time	88	69	175	152	87	83	182	144	94	75
	Finchley Road north of Hilgrove Road	Max. cycle time	44	44	120	104	76	60	120	104	32	16
		Max. wait time	83	79	169	102	86	23	203	183	120	104
	Avenue Road north of Adelaide Road	Max. cycle time	88	88	120	104	32	16	120	104	32	16
		Max. wait time	155	122	95	96	-60	-25	95	98	-60	-24
	Avenue Road south of Adelaide Road	Max. cycle time	88	88	120	104	32	16	120	104	32	16
		Max. wait time	133	129	114	96	-19	-33	114	98	-19	-31
Adelaide Road	Max. cycle time	88	88	120	104	32	16	120	104	32	16	
	Max. wait time	95	110	95	96	0	-14	95	98	0	-12	

Appendix B: Improving road user behaviour

Our approach is to promote the message that the Highway Code must be adhered to by all road users, and we are strongly in favour of promoting the ethos of 'responsible cycling' and mutual respect between cyclists and other road users. This means working to eliminate offences such as jumping red lights, cycling on the pavement, and cycling at night without adequate lighting.

Cyclists are expected to follow the same rules in the Highway Code as other road users as per the Road Traffic Act 1991.

Cyclists who go through red lights, or cycle on pavements, can be given a Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN), which carries a fine of £50. FPNs of up to £50 can also be given to cyclists who do not use lights outside of daylight hours.

In certain circumstances, cyclists could be fined up to £2,500 for dangerous cycling and up to £1,000 for careless cycling. These could include incidents where cycling on a pavement has severely compromised the safety of another road user and/or resulted in the injury of a pedestrian.

Enforcement activity is conducted using a balanced approach between motorists and cyclists, and action is taken against motorists who behave irresponsibly – for example, driving while using a mobile phone or disobeying traffic signals.

Enforcement

Our emphasis is on improving road user behaviour through a balanced programme of education and enforcement.

We fund a Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) Safer Transport Team (STT) in every London borough, which provides high-visibility policing on the road and surface transport network. All STTs have six main objectives, one of which is improving cyclist safety. STTs engage with the public to help them set their policing priorities, and work alongside MPS Safer Neighbourhood Teams as necessary.

The police will concentrate their resources on those issues of most concern based on intelligence. Concerns pertaining to a particular location can be reported to the Metropolitan Police Service via the Road Safe London website (www.met.police.uk/roadsafelondon), which has been set up to allow the public to pass on information in confidence about illegal or nuisance road use.

Roads and Transport Policing Command (RTPC)

We have worked with the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) to create the new MPS Roads and Transport Policing Command (RTPC), comprising over 2,300 officers, all making road safety and road reliability a key priority. We work in close partnership with the MPS RTPC to reduce Killed and Serious Injury (KSI) casualties on London's

roads through targeted enforcement, engagement and education. The RTPC went operationally live in December 2014.

The creation of the RTPC is featured under commitment 4 of the 'Safe Streets for London: Our six road safety commitments.' This document can be found at:

<http://www.tfl.gov.uk/cdn/static/cms/documents/safe-london-streets-our-six-road-safety-commitments.pdf>.

Cycle Safety Team (formerly known as the Cycle Task Force)

We fund officers within the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) Cycle Safety Team to engage and educate all road users and enforce against irresponsible behaviour.

All are qualified traffic officers, trained police pursuit drivers and motorcyclists with qualifications in collision investigation and vehicle examination. Most are also qualified to drive Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs).

The team leads on the Exchanging Places programme (see below), which gives cyclists the opportunity to see the road from the driver's seat of an HGV, and these officers have also advised at HGV driver training (Certificate of Professional Competence) courses run by Crossrail.

The team engages in enforcement of all road users. Approximately 50 per cent of offences reported are committed by car drivers and motorcycle riders, 26 per cent by commercial vehicle drivers and 24 per cent by cyclists.

Exchanging Places

Exchanging Places events allow cyclists the opportunity to get into the cab of a Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) or bus and learn about their blind spots to get a better understanding of what the driver can and can't see, especially in regards to cyclists on the nearside and directly in front of the vehicle. Exchanging Places events take place on average once a week in London, and are run by the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) and City of London Police. The scheme is organised by MPS Roads and Transport Policing Command and the City of London Police in partnership with Transport for London and a number of freight operators, and works with private and public bodies to tailor events.

Over 20,000 cyclists have taken part in an MPS Exchanging Places event since they started in 2007. Feedback shows that 99 per cent of participants would recommend the programme to a friend and 97 per cent will change their riding habits as a result of the experience. The Exchanging Places programme was awarded a Prince Michael International Road Safety Award in 2013.

To learn more about Exchanging Places, visit www.tinyurl.com/explacesvideo.

Details of future events can be found at

<http://content.met.police.uk/Site/safertransportcyclesafety>.

Capital Cycle Safe

The MPS Cycle Safety Team has piloted a new Penalty Notice for offences committed by cyclists. Cyclists may be offered the opportunity to complete the Capital Cycle Safe online cycle safety course for a reduction of the penalty amount. Up until August 2015, the Cycle Safety Team had issued over 4,000 notices for the course, which is produced by AA Drivetech. This scheme is being updated and is being rolled out to other UK police forces.

Community Roadwatch

We are working in partnership with the Metropolitan Police Service and City of London Police to run Community Roadwatch, a road safety initiative that aims to reduce speeding in residential areas.

Community Roadwatch gives local residents the opportunity to work side by side with their local police teams, and use speed detection equipment to identify speeding vehicles in their communities. Warning letters are issued where appropriate, and the information captured may help to inform the future activity of local police teams.

Community Roadwatch is being rolled out across London in phases, with a commitment to reach all London boroughs by December 2015.

If you would like to take part in Community Roadwatch, or wish to suggest a residential area where there are community concerns around speeding, contact the teams via www.tfl.gov.uk/CommunityRoadwatch.