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Executive summary

Between 23 September and 2 November 2014, Transport for London (TfL) consulted on proposals for upgrades to the Barclays Cycle Superhighway Route 2 (CS2) between Aldgate and Bow roundabout. We received 1,455 direct responses to the consultation, of which 89% supported or partially supported our proposals. We also received 2,215 supportive template emails submitted via the London Cycling Campaign website. With these emails, the support rate is 95%.

After considering all responses, we plan to proceed with the scheme with a number of changes, the most significant of which are:

- Creating a 5 metre wide eastbound bus lane which will include a 2 metre wide mandatory cycle lane outside Whitechapel market to accommodate the specific needs of the market and its operation. We will maintain the existing inset loading bays and hours of operation. We will work with Whitechapel market traders to ensure that the bus lane and cycle track remain unobstructed along this section of the route. We will also use the existing bus stop designs in this location rather than bus stop bypasses, as the 5 metre bus lane leaves around 2 metres for cyclists to pass on the outside of buses. A drawing of the new design at Whitechapel market is available at [tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade](http://tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade)

- Where a side road or property access does not create a break in the kerb segregation to allow cyclists to enter and leave the cycle track before a bus stop bypass, we will create a break to allow them to do so

- Extending the loading bays outside Whitechapel Gallery to ensure that exhibitions and the deliveries and servicing of neighbouring local businesses can continue smoothly

- The 25 metre parking bay at Goulston Street will be changed to a loading bay to increase loading provision in the area and meet the requirements of local businesses

- Changes to the Barclays Cycle Hire docking station at New Road, including the removal of 10 docking points to leave 26 remaining

- We will need to remove approximately 20 smaller trees and 2 larger trees. This number has increased from 18 since consultation following changes to the design and further investigations. We continue to investigate how to minimise the loss of trees and we are looking for new locations to replace trees wherever possible

- Removing slightly less pavement space in some areas, including outside Mile End station and west of Adler Street

TfL will recommend to its Board that the CS2 upgrade progresses to construction as proposed in the consultation documents, subject to the changes described above and a number of other minor design alterations. Subject to a final decision by TfL Board, we plan to start construction work in early 2015.

This document explains the processes, responses and outcomes of the recent consultation, and sets out our response to issues commonly raised.
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1. Introduction

The Mayor of London’s Vision for Cycling, launched in March 2013, contains an ambitious target to double the number of people cycling in Greater London over the next decade. To achieve this growth Transport for London (TfL) is planning a far-reaching programme of cycling provision to make the capital’s streets more attractive for cycling to more people, especially those groups currently under-represented among cyclists, including women, young people and older people.

Barclays Cycle Superhighways are TfL’s flagship cycling programme and aim to provide a London-wide network of direct and high-capacity cycle routes, mostly along main roads. The Superhighways provide safe, comfortable and convenient journeys for anyone on a bicycle and essential links between London’s suburbs and the city centre, and for shorter journeys in between.

CS2 was launched in 2011 and runs between Aldgate and Bow roundabout. In November 2013, the Mayor of London announced plans to upgrade CS2.

The Barclays Cycle Superhighway 2 Extension (CS2X) opened in November 2013, taking the route from Bow roundabout to Stratford and using design features such as fully segregated cycle tracks and bus stop bypasses to improve cyclist safety.

The CS2 upgrade would bring the cycle facilities between Aldgate and Bow roundabout to the same standard as those on CS2X. We would create kerb and wand-separated cycle tracks along the whole route and new junctions to separate cyclists from other traffic. The proposals would greatly improve safety and comfort for cyclists.

1.1 Purpose of the scheme

We are determined to ensure London’s roads are as safe as they can be for cyclists. CS2 runs on a busy and intimidating road, but currently offers cyclists no physical protection from motor traffic.

The number of cyclists on CS2 increased by 32 per cent in the year after the route opened.* At some points on the route, the average number of cyclists a day is around 2,000 in each direction.** This upgrade would improve safety and convenience for these cyclists. It would also encourage the many people who would like to cycle but currently feel unable to do so.

*Source: TfL traffic counts, September 2010 - September 2012.
**Source: TfL central cordon count surveys.

1.2 Description of the proposals

CS2 between Aldgate and Bow roundabout runs along a TfL-managed road entirely in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets. The proposed design features included:

- Kerb and wand-separated cycle tracks. A kerb would separate cyclists from motor traffic and buses along most of the route. Where there is less space, cyclists would be separated from traffic and buses by highly visible traffic ‘wands’ - regularly spaced flexible poles that clearly define the cycle track. There would be gaps for side roads, junctions and access to properties

- Bus stop bypasses. We would install bus stop bypasses of the kind that already operate between Bow roundabout and Stratford. Cyclists would be directed behind
the bus stop on a carriageway-level cycle track. Bus passengers would access a waiting area by crossing the cycle track using a raised, marked crossing point.

- New junction designs. We proposed two new types of junction along the route. These redesigned junctions would remove or reduce conflict between cyclists and left-turning vehicles. At some locations, we also proposed innovative methods of allowing cyclists to turn right and signals to allow cyclists to proceed ahead of other traffic, subject to Department for Transport approval.

1.3 Overview map

![Overview map of Cycle Superhighway 2 Upgrade](image_url)
2. Consultation

2.1 Consultation structure

This CS2 upgrade consultation ran from 23 September to 2 November 2014. Information on the consultation can be viewed at tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade. The proposals were broken down into seven sections:

- Section 1 – Aldgate to White Church Lane
- Section 2 – White Church Lane to Cambridge Heath Road
- Section 3 – Cambridge Heath Road to Beaumont Grove
- Section 4 – Beaumont Grove to Westfield Way
- Section 5 – Westfield Way to Merchant Street
- Section 6 – Merchant Street to Bromley High Street
- Section 7 – Bromley High Street to Bow Roundabout

For each section and the overall scheme, respondents were asked about their level of support for the proposals (‘support’, ‘partially support’, ‘don’t support’, ‘not sure’, ‘no opinion’). Respondents were also given an opportunity to provide comments on each section of the proposal and the overall scheme.

Respondents were also asked to submit their name, email address, postcode, along with information about their cycling and other travel habits. All questions were optional, apart from the question asking for overall views on the proposal. Other information, such as the respondent’s IP address and the date and time of responding, was recorded automatically. All data is held under conditions that conform to the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998.
2.2 Stakeholder meetings

TfL met a number of stakeholder groups before and during consultation to discuss our proposals.

Better Junctions Design Review Group: CS2 upgrade workshop

Freight industry engagement meeting
Representatives from the Freight Transport Association, Triangle, G4S, DHL TradeTeam, John Lewis Partnership, Federation of Small Businesses and the Brewery Logistics Group.

London Visually Impaired Forum Planning Group meeting

Other stakeholders who we met included:

- Aldgate Business Forum
- Cab Ranks Committee
  - Licensed Taxi Drivers Association
  - Unite the Union
  - London Cab Drivers Club
- London Cycling Campaign, including Tower Hamlets Wheelers
- Metropolitan Police
- Queen Mary University of London
- Tower Hamlets Accessibility Forum
- Tower Hamlets Officers and Councillors
- Whitechapel Gallery
- Whitechapel Market Traders
2.4 Consultation material, distribution and publicity

On 23 September 2014, detailed information on the proposals was published at tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade. This consultation information included a leaflet with an overview route map, detailed design drawings of each section, visualisations of Whitechapel Road and Bow Road and Mornington Grove and descriptions of the proposals.

Additional information summarising benefits and impacts for other road users was added to the consultation website on 1 October 2014. This included a summary of predicted journey time impacts through the scheme area. We alerted people to this additional information by including a prominently-placed note on the website and by emailing stakeholders and consultation respondents who had provided email addresses. We also provided a website which allowed anyone who had responded to consultation to change their support level or leave additional comments based on having considered the additional information.

Consultation information was also made available on paper via Freepost on request and on large format displays at the public events held at Queen Mary University of London and Idea Store Whitechapel. Paper response forms were also available at public events, where members of the project design teams were present to discuss the proposals with visitors and answer questions.

The consultation information was publicised via the following channels:

**Leaflet to households:** We sent an eight-page colour A5 leaflet outlining the proposals to 59,875 addresses (the leaflet and distribution map are in Appendix C). The leaflet summarised the proposals and gave a link to the online consultation information and survey.

**Letters to properties directly affected by changes to parking and loading arrangements:** We sent a letter and a map detailing specific local proposed changes to parking and loading to 2,875 addresses within 20 metres of the route. The letter also included a summary of the wider proposals based on the material on the consultation website.

**Emails to individuals:** We emailed around over 78,000 people on the TfL database who are known to cycle, drive or use public transport in the area (see the email in Appendix D). The email briefly described the proposed scheme, and invited recipients to find out more and respond via the consultation website.

**Emails to stakeholders:** We emailed approximately 700 stakeholders (see Appendix D for the email and Appendix E for the list of recipients). The email contained a summary of the proposals and a link to the consultation website. Recipients included:
- Police and the emergency services
- Politicians (national, regional and local)
- London local authorities
- Disability rights groups
- Residents’ associations
- Transport user groups
- Road operator groups

**Press and media:** TfL issued a press release on 22 September 2014. This release is in Appendix G with links to media coverage.
Marketing activities including: Google text ads, mobile and desktop (including Facebook) display banners, postcode-targeted MMS messaging and face-to-face leafleting to promote consultation drop-in events. The digital marketing assets are available in Appendix H.

Public drop-in events: We held five events near the proposed route to provide an opportunity for people to give feedback. The events were at:

Queen Mary University of London, Library Square
Mile End Road, London E1 4NS
- Wednesday 24 September 1100-1400

Idea Store Whitechapel, Lab 1a
321 Whitechapel Road, London E1 1BU
- Saturday 27 September 1100-1500
- Tuesday 7 October 1500-1900
- Friday 10 October 1000-1400

Brady Arts & Community Centre
192-196 Hanbury St, London E1 5HU
- Tuesday 21 October 1200-1400

TfL staff involved with the CS2U proposal also attended the Access All Areas event www.tfl.gov.uk/access-all-areas, aimed at helping more disabled and older people use the TfL network, on Thursday 2 October.

Individuals and stakeholders were invited to respond by either using the online survey on our website, by emailing TfL at consultations@tfl.gov.uk, or by filling in a paper feedback form (available at events or by post on request).
3. Responses to consultation

3.1 Overview of consultation responses

3.1.1 Overall level of support

There were 1,455 responses to the Barclays Cycle Superhighway 2 upgrade consultation. 35 responses were from stakeholders and 1,420 were from members of the public.

Support or otherwise for the proposals

![Support chart]

78% Support 11% Partially support 1% Not sure 1% No opinion 9% Don't support

Summary of quantitative responses

There were 1,455 responses to the mandatory question about respondents’ support for the overall scheme. Of the individual sections, Section 5 received the most feedback with 79%. Sections 6 and 7 received the least feedback with 76%.

Summary of responses to CS2 consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Total responses</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Partially support</th>
<th>Total support</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Don't support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>78% (1129)</td>
<td>11% (160)</td>
<td>89% (1282)</td>
<td>1% (12)</td>
<td>1% (19)</td>
<td>9% (135)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1118 (77%)</td>
<td>80% (898)</td>
<td>5% (61)</td>
<td>85% (959)</td>
<td>1% (16)</td>
<td>4% (43)</td>
<td>9% (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1110 (77%)</td>
<td>80% (883)</td>
<td>5% (60)</td>
<td>85% (943)</td>
<td>2% (21)</td>
<td>4% (39)</td>
<td>10% (107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1106 (77%)</td>
<td>79% (878)</td>
<td>6% (65)</td>
<td>85% (943)</td>
<td>2% (20)</td>
<td>4% (47)</td>
<td>9% (96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1105 (77%)</td>
<td>76% (844)</td>
<td>8% (89)</td>
<td>84% (933)</td>
<td>2% (18)</td>
<td>4% (49)</td>
<td>10% (105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1141 (79%)</td>
<td>73% (834)</td>
<td>7% (77)</td>
<td>80% (911)</td>
<td>1% (13)</td>
<td>3% (35)</td>
<td>16% (182)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1099 (76%)</td>
<td>79% (869)</td>
<td>5% (57)</td>
<td>84% (926)</td>
<td>2% (22)</td>
<td>5% (58)</td>
<td>8% (93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1094 (76%)</td>
<td>81% (882)</td>
<td>5% (50)</td>
<td>86% (932)</td>
<td>2% (19)</td>
<td>5% (58)</td>
<td>8% (85)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TfL commissioned JMP Consultants Ltd. to analyse the responses to the CS2 upgrade consultation.
3.2 About the respondents

Responses by postcode
31% of respondents gave an E3 postcode (between Mile End and Bow, extending to Regent’s Canal in the north and Limehouse Cut in the south). 22% of respondents reported an E1 postcode (Aldgate, Whitechapel and part of Mile End).

Top 10 postcode districts supplied by respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postcode District</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.2 How often did respondents say they cycled?
The majority of respondents said they were regular cyclists, with 55% (777) saying they ride most days and 15% (217) riding about once weekly. Less frequent cyclists accounted for 18% (243) of respondents, while 12% (164) said they never cycled.

Respondents who cycle most days were most supportive of the proposals. 91% (710) fully supported and 6% (49) partially supported the overall scheme. Occasional cyclists (cycle once a week or about 1-3 times a month) were less supportive of the proposals: 84% (158) fully or partially supported the scheme. Nearly two thirds of those respondents who said they never cycle (104/64%) supported the overall proposals.

On average, how often do you cycle?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (Count)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most days</td>
<td>55% (777)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a week</td>
<td>15% (217)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About 1–3 times a month</td>
<td>9% (122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less often</td>
<td>9% (121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>12% (164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total answered (of 1455)</td>
<td>1401 (97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered (of 1455)</td>
<td>43 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cycle most days and...

- Fully or partially support: 98% (799)
- Don’t support: 2% (15)
- Not sure/no opinion/not answered: 0% (3)

Occasionally cycle and...

- Fully or partially support: 86% (397)
- Don’t support: 12% (56)
- Not sure/no opinion/not answered: 2% (7)

Never cycle and...

- Fully or partially support: 64% (104)
- Don’t support: 32% (53)
- Not sure/no opinion/not answered: 4% (7)
3.2.3 How did respondents say they heard about the consultation?

Almost half of respondents (669 respondents/46%) heard about the consultation via email. 293 respondents (20%) were informed by a TfL leaflet, with 238 (16%) receiving this leaflet through their door, and 55 (4%) being handed the leaflet by a TfL representative. 87 (6%) of respondents heard about the consultation through online adverts. Nearly a quarter of respondents (352 respondents/24%) said they heard about the consultation through an ‘other’ source.

Among ‘others’, the most common were:

- Social media (49/3%)
- Via a friend (37/3%)
- London Cycling Campaign (36/2%)
- News (TV, newspaper) (32/2%)
- TfL website (16/1%)
- Other consultation or consultation hub (12/1%)
- Other website (10/1%)

How did respondents say they heard about the consultation?
3.2.4 Comments on the consultation

429 respondents (30% of respondents to the consultation) commented on the consultation process and materials.

The main themes included:

- General praise for material and website content and design: 32 respondents (7%)
- Suggestions that the consultation should have been better publicised (17 respondents/4%), including in local papers and along the existing cycle route
- General praise (e.g.: “Good”, “Excellent” and “Well done”): 14 respondents (3%)
- Suggestions that additional information should have been provided, such as greater impact on journey times and impact on local residents: 8 respondents (2%)
- Printed material, including maps, could be clearer: 4 respondents (<1%)

3.3 Summary of comments

3.3.1 Comments on the overall scheme

Of the 1,455 respondents who replied to the consultation, 565 (38%) gave further comments in the open text box for the overall scheme. Common issues included:

Support/positive comments: 311 (21% of all respondents) offered positive comments. 175 respondents (12%) felt the upgrades would improve safety for cyclists and 120 respondents (8%) gave generic positive/supportive comments (e.g. “Excellent”). 49 respondents (3%) suggested that the upgrades would encourage more cycling, and 14 respondents (1%) suggested it would benefit the environment through encouraging mode change.

Segregation: 89 respondents (6% of all respondents) commented on segregation, with 55 respondents (4%) supportive. Reasons for concern or opposition included safety, loss of traffic lanes and increased congestion.

Impacts on bus services: 51 (4%) respondents commented on the bus impacts. Most comments were about the negative impact of the proposals on bus journey times and increased congestion.

Parking and loading: 34 respondents (2%) referred to parking and loading. Supportive comments (11/<1%) included support for loading and parking bay bypasses and relocating parking bays. Opposing comments (14/1%) included reducing available loading bay space, sharing loading bay space, and potential issues at Whitechapel market.

Pollution/environmental impacts: 26 (2%) respondents mentioned pollution and environmental impacts of the proposals. 10 (<1%) respondents said the proposals will increase pollution levels and 7 (<1%) said they will reduce pollution levels. Other respondents asked for more information on the pollution impacts on the scheme and said more should be done to tackle any impacts.

Bus stop bypasses: 24 respondents (2%) mentioned bus stop bypasses. Most opposed them, citing potential conflict between bus users, pedestrians and cyclists and their unfriendliness for disabled road users.
Traffic wands: 23 respondents (2%) referred to traffic ‘wands’ used to create semi-segregated lanes. Most respondents opposed their use. Responses included claims that they were unsafe for cyclists and not visible to motorists.

Cyclist, driver & pedestrian behaviour: 17 respondents (1%) mentioned route-user behaviour (behaviour of cyclists, pedestrians or motorists), with the most frequent comment on poor cyclist behaviour on the route.

Speed limit: 3 respondents (<1%) requested that the speed limit is reduced to further increase safety on the route.

A fuller summary of comments is available in Appendix A.

3.3.2 Comments on proposals for sections of route
This is an overview of the main issues that respondents raised about the proposals for Sections 1 to 7 and the number of comments as a percentage of responses to that section. A more detailed section-by-section summary of responses is available in Appendix A.

Issues included:

Banned right turns at Mile End Road/Burdett Road: A total of 140 of all respondents (12%) opposed the proposed ban of right turns from Mile End Road onto Burdett Road and Burdett Road into Mile End Road.

Whitechapel market proposals: 49 respondents (4%) refer to the proposals in the vicinity of Whitechapel market. Comments included the impacts on the operation of the market, loading safely across the track and the challenges of the limited available road space in the area.

Bow roundabout: Although not part of the proposals, 38 respondents (3%) refer to Bow roundabout. Many comments were about the urgency of improvements given the number of accidents here.

Shared cycle and bus lane: 37 respondents (3%) comment on the merging of the cycle and bus lane to the east of the junction of Mile End Road and Globe Road/White Horse Lane, with most respondents opposing the lack of a segregated track here.

Leman Street junction: 29 respondents (3%) commented on the junction of Whitechapel High Street and Leman Street including 11 (<1%) comments opposing the banned turn, 5 comments (<1%) saying Leman Street should be two-way for cyclists and 4 comments (<1%) about current issues for pedestrians.

Banned right turn from Whitechapel Road to Stepney Green: 25 respondents (2% of all respondents to this section) refer to this banned right turn, with 22 respondents (2%) against it.

Commercial Street junction: 23 (2%) comments address the proposals at the junction of Whitechapel High Street and Commercial Street.
3.4 Stakeholder responses

Of the 1,455 consultation responses, we identified 35 as coming from stakeholder groups. The stakeholders are grouped according to their interests and then listed in alphabetical order below. Stakeholder comments are also covered in the analysis of section-by-section responses in Appendix A.

Bus operators

Tower Transit
Concerns over impact on:
- Bus journey times and journey time reliability from route and construction
- Resulting increased operating costs
- Safety issues in bus lanes that are available for cyclists

Noted that Bow Church bus stop is a driver changeover point and needs to accommodate waiting buses. Welcomed some bus stop changes at Whitechapel.

Cycling groups

Brent Cyclists
Supported general design principles, but suggested some changes including leaving cyclist left turns unsignalised generally, splayed kerbs and a dedicated left turn for cyclists at Commercial Street.

Cycling Embassy of Great Britain
Support for design principles but requested further provision, including more ‘Dutch’ design principles, splayed kerbs and building cycle track level between pavement and road level.

Site specific concerns: suggested Cambridge Heath Junction in Section 3 should use better (protected) right-turn movements, and/or simultaneous green and protected cycle facilities east of White Horse Lane.

London Cycling Campaign (LCC)
Called for introduction of better designed cycling infrastructure, noting the number of fatalities on route. Concerns and requests included:
- Making access at junctions and side roads safer
- ‘Gaps’ in route at Stepney Green, Bow roundabout
- Using LCC’s alternative ‘hold the left turn’ junction design and phasing
- Lanes should be more than 2 metres wide and not be narrowed at bus stop bypasses
- Other changes to track design including close consideration of drainage design
- The pedestrian crossing area at bus stop bypasses should be longer
- Concerns with traffic modelling methodology
- Request for segregated space east of White Horse Lane

LCC also ran a campaign on their website, through which 2,215 responses were received (described in Section 3.5).
Tower Hamlets Wheelers
Supported proposals and highlighted that the upgrade would encourage more people to cycle on the route. Comments included:

- Segregated stretches should continue closer to junctions to increase protection for cyclists at side roads
- Reserving judgement on bus stop bypasses in light of ongoing discussion between LCC and disability group users
- Changes to improve junctions and use of alternative junction design at Cambridge Heath Road
- Changes to pedestrian crossings at some locations
- Site specific concerns for some proposals at Whitechapel market, shared use at Bancroft Road and Mile End Road/Burdett Road junction

Sustrans
Overall support especially for physical segregation and separate traffic signal phases. However, would like more consistency in segregation and other design features. Comments highlighted the importance of legibility for road users and included:

- Standardise treatments and improve safety at side roads; tighter corners to reduce left-hook risk
- Strong support for bus stop bypasses, but considered detail may need refinement
- Concerned over compromising pedestrian provision and bus lane shortening
- Improvements to Bow roundabout
- Suggests cycle track design changes including more consistent segregation, less use of wands and the use of splayed kerbs

Emergency services

London Ambulance Service
Requested that central reservation is removed if the route narrows to one lane and asked to be advised about construction.

London Fire Brigade
Supported overall and requested detailed traffic modelling for the construction period and the finished route. Also asked about mitigating measures during construction. Sought assurance that traffic management orders would not hinder service provision and that access to properties for emergency services would be maintained.

Metropolitan Police Service
Support overall proposals as believe they will significantly improve safety for cyclists but raised concerns over:

- Potential safety implications at junctions and side roads due to new road layout
- Impact of increased journey times and reduced road width
- Compliance with new cycle signals
- Impact of banned turns at Mile End/Burdett and Leman Street
Use of bus stop bypasses on a busier route
Unsegregated section east of White Horse Lane

Suggestions included:
- Monitoring and communications strategy on new design layouts with involvement from Metropolitan Police Service
- Making pedestrian crossings straight ahead/staggered where appropriate and installing pedestrian guard rail on central islands
- Making traffic wands more visible
- Relocated CCTV cameras should not decrease coverage

Faith and cultural

East London Mosque
Overall support but concerned about impact on other road users, including increased journey times. Concerns for area outside Mosque included:
- Do not support narrowed footway due to high pedestrian activity at prayer time
- Lack of new site for Altab Ali docking station
- Moving or removing bus stops
- Removing trees

ELT Baptist Church
Concerned that banning right turn Mile End into Burdett will inconvenience church traffic.

English Heritage
Supported proposals.

Queen Mary University of London (QMU)
Supported proposals and asks that they are implemented soon. Highlighted fatality outside QMU last year and the benefits of safer cycling facility for QMU students and staff travelling between campuses. Also commented on the wider benefits of cycling.

Whitechapel Gallery
General support, but strong opposition to aspects which could affect the gallery and its business. Particular concern about the impact of the reduced loading facility on safe and efficient loading. Other concerns included the impact on gallery visitors through the loss of footway, coach and disabled access.

Freight groups and operators

Brewery Logistics Group and British Beer & Pub Association
Supported ensuring safety of all road users but highlighted that freight deliveries are vital for Londoners and need kerbside access. Questioned diversity of segregation used and how wands have been evaluated.
Parking and loading: questioned the reduction of loading bay area and highlighted potential difficulties with loading and servicing at some locations.

Modelling concerns: commented that TfL had not given information on road speeds and outer London congestion. Asked whether impact of banned turns was included in traffic modelling confirmation and whether East-West and North-South Cycle Superhighways were modelled as part of CS2.

Cycle track design: commented that cycle tracks were not wide enough for demand and pointed out potential impact on pub deliveries. Also that CS2 will encourage traffic to use side roads.

Safety legislation: concern at potential conflict with HSE guidance and working time directives.

Express Networks Forum
Broadly supported the principles of proposals to improve cycle safety but concerned over the impacts and increased time and cost for the freight and delivery industry and possible safety implications of delivering over the cycle track.

Comments included:
- Narrower traffic lanes could cause a problem to delivery vehicles needing to stop
- Concerns over loss of parking and loading: claimed more is lost than TfL claims
- Suggested that loading bays could be not available to blue badge holders
- Commercial traffic will increase and TfL traffic modelling doesn’t show impacts

Freight Transport Association (FTA): Supports in principle, but stresses the need for a balance in the use of road space. Concerns included:
- Duration and timing of consultation
- Request additional traffic modelling and environmental data
- Longer journeys mean more freight vehicles on the roads, adding to congestion, pollution and costs
- Impact of segregation on kerbside access; request semi-segregation
- Support efforts to re-time deliveries but note that it is not always feasible

G4S
Concerns over loading time restrictions reduction of parking and loading at some locations and suggest revising loading time restrictions to reflect traffic flow. Don’t support disabled users parking in loading bays.

Road Haulage Association
General support for proposals. Noted that cyclists can be intimidating for drivers and the importance of understanding and consideration from all road users. Concerns over:
- Potential for increased risk during deliveries
- Loading by reduction and sharing loading bays with disabled parking
- Increased journey times
- Cyclist compliance at lights and choosing not to use cycle lane
- Impact at Whitechapel market and removal of central reservation outside station
Local Authorities

City of London Corporation
Supports schemes that improve road safety, the environment and sustainable public transport. Comments included:
- Concern over increased traffic entering City of London
- Support for reduced pedestrian wait times and changes to signal timings at Aldgate gyratory
- Would welcome coordinating Aldgate works to minimise disruption

London Borough of Newham
Supportive and highlighted potential safety improvements. Comments included:
- Request for hold the left turns at junctions
- Support for bus stop bypasses
- Using CS2 upgrade junction designs for Stratford gyratory and CS2 extension
- Asked for more detail about Bow roundabout improvements and the cycle early starts on the route
- TfL modelling does not account for a modal shift to cycling
- Design should take account of the needs of visually impaired road users and that pedestrian experience after construction should be monitored
- Road users should be educated about the new two-stage right turns

London Borough of Tower Hamlets
Concerned over many technical issues and look forward to continued engagement with TfL. Noted the potential impact on vulnerable road users including children, older people and disabled road users and would like to see more measures considered to improve safety. Had concerns over the delivery timetable of the scheme and requested a formal response from TfL and a forum to monitor operational impacts.

General design concerns included:
- suitability of bus stop bypasses for the route
- cyclists may not comply with new junction design layouts
- banned turns (particularly at Mile End Road/Burdett Road) and potential traffic impacts on borough side roads

Site-specific concerns included:
- the impact on the operation of Whitechapel market
- cutting back Mile End waste
- proposals at Stepney Green and Globe Road
- the lack of provision of cycle facilities east of White Horse Lane

Suggestions included:
- a 20mph speed limit at Whitechapel market
- revised bus stop bypass design
- retaining inset loading bays at Whitechapel market
- ensuring compatibility with the Whitechapel Vision
Local businesses

Lidl UK
Servicing and loading for businesses on north side of Whitechapel Road should be considered. Request for more local business involvement.

Whitechapel Business and Traders Association UK
Oppose changes at Whitechapel market due to:
- Safety concerns surrounding impact of cycle track on busy pedestrian area and loading requirements
- Proximity of cycle track to stalls and risk of articles being blown into cycle lane
- Practical difficulties with servicing the markets and the businesses

The Whitechapel Business and Traders Association also submitted a petition, described in Section 3.5.

Wildcross Properties
Opposed to impacts on business of relocated bus stop and removal of loading bay outside office.

Pedestrian and accessibility groups

Guide Dogs
Mainly concerned over safety and crossing priority for visually impaired people at bus stop bypasses, and cyclists' speed and potential to frighten guide dogs. Suggestions included:
- Tactile paving needed on both sides of the crossing
- Pedestrians should have priority
- More measures to slow cyclists including bright colours on the cycle track and consistent design and installation

Concluded that the current design could impact upon visually impaired people.

Living Streets
Supported TfL’s ambition to improve conditions for cyclists, but opposed or had concerns about proposals including:
- Pedestrian impacts such as reduced pavements and increased wait times
- Pedestrian crossings not being on the desire line and straight across
- Shared use areas and bus stop bypasses

London TravelWatch
Supports increase in cycling, but stresses striking the balance between road users. Concerns over:
- Scope of proposals
- Impact on bus journey times
- New bus stop designs could stop visually impaired using bus services
- Removal of footway and longer pedestrian wait times
Greater road safety risk in some places

Suggestions included launching bus priority programmes soon and phasing Cycle Superhighway construction. Would support providing more pedestrian crossings.

Political

John Biggs, London Assembly Member
Supported improvements to CS2 but concerned at some aspects, particularly the Mile End/Burdett and Leman Street banned turns and the Whitechapel market proposals. Requests included:

- Ensuring the impacts on all groups of road users communicated clearly
- More modelling information should be provided
- How TfL evidenced design changes and will mitigate impacts with Tower Hamlets
- TfL to confirm that CS2 upgrade would interface with different City of London priorities at Aldgate
- Address Bow roundabout as a priority

Tower Hamlets Labour Group
Supported overall scheme and five out of seven sections. Highlighted its support for the efforts of the London Cycling Campaign and Tower Hamlets Wheelers to improve cyclist safety. Other issues raised included:

- TfL should continue to consult with Whitechapel market traders to address concerns
- Concern over lack of modelling for Mile End/Burdett banned turns, which will increase traffic on Roman Road and Bow Road
- Bus stop bypasses serving bus route 25 could get overcrowded and present risks for cyclists and bus users

Residents groups

Fairfield Quarter Residents Association
Supported proposals to improve cyclist safety. Suggested changes to bus stops at some locations, including improving the interchange at Whitechapel Station/Royal London Hospital. Highlighted need for suitable provision for pedestrians and disabled bus passengers. Considered Whitechapel eastbound and Mile End Bus Station bus stops are too busy for current designs to be effective.

MEOTRA (Mile End Old Town Residents Association)
Supported improved safety for cyclists but had concerns over the Mile End/Burdett banned turns and pedestrian safety, including reduced footway. Highlighted the need to improve pedestrian provision at some locations.
Roman Road Resident & Business Association
Overall scheme support, but opposed Mile End/Burdett Road banned turns and the resulting increased traffic on Roman Road.

Taxi groups

GMB Professional Drivers Branch
Concerns included:
- Traffic impacts on a key London arterial route and side streets.
- Loss of parking and loading
- Kerbside access for taxis
- Suggested cyclists only use segregated lanes
- Suggested cyclists should follow the Highway Code

Licensed Taxi Drivers Association
Concerns included:
- Banned turns
- Relocation of the Mile End rank and Maplin Street feeder rank
- Shortening the bus lane in Section 2
- Lack of kerbside access forcing taxis to stop in traffic lanes
- Wheelchair accessibility
- Journey time impacts and the
- Potential risks of crossing the cycle track
3.5 Campaign emails and petitions

3.5.1 London Cycling Campaign petition

The London Cycling Campaign (LCC) ran a campaign supporting the CS2 upgrade proposals. It generated 2,215 responses (after the removal of 61 duplicates) based on a template provided on the LCC website. The template email offered broad support for the proposals, while requesting additional provision for cyclists in some areas. The main points raised were:

- Concern over the fatality record on the route and request for dedicated space for cycling
- Concern over the unsegregated section east of White Horse Lane outside the Ocean Estate
- Support for ‘hold the left turn’ designs at junctions
- Acknowledgement of potential for short term traffic delays
- The benefits of cycling improvement including safety and improved air quality
- The current high demand and potential encouragement for those who do not currently cycle

The full text of the email is in Appendix G.

Of the 2,215 emails we received, 2,061 (93%) consisted of the unchanged template email text. The remaining 154 (7%) emails were altered and 107 (5%) contained significant changes or additions. Issues raised in the altered emails included:

Safety

- Personal safety (for self and/or individuals known to the respondent): 29 respondents (27%)
- General safety (for other cyclists/road users): 28 (26%)
- Dangerous driving on the route: 4 (4%)
- Personal involvement in an accident or near miss on CS2: 4 (4%)
- The potential for conflict between cycles and buses: 2 (2%)

Criticism of CS2

- Negative comment about the current CS2: 23 (21%)

Experience/familiarity with CS2

- Current or past CS2 cyclist: 27 (25%)
- Cyclist, but doesn’t use CS2: 11 (10%)
- Lives close to CS2: 6 (6%)
- Friend or family member cycles: 3 (3%)
Motor traffic impacts

- There would be fewer cars as a result of the upgrade: 8 (7%)
- There would be less traffic/congestion as a result of the upgrade: 8 (7%)
- Improved air quality from more cyclists. 7 (7%)

Design and purpose

- Welcomes a specific part of the proposal: 4 (4%)
- Examples of good cycling facilities elsewhere: 4 (4%)
- Requests an improvement to the proposal, or provides a specific idea(s) improve it: 3 (3%)

Benefits of encouraging cycling

- The upgrade would encourage more cyclists and cycle journeys: 7 (7%)
- Physical and other health benefits of cycling: 5 (5%)
- I would cycle more or start cycling after the upgrade: 2 (2%)

Other comments

- General comment about cycling policy/state of affairs: 17 (16%)
- A request to implement the proposal quickly: 10 (9%)
- There needs to be more education of road users: 3 (3%)
- Stakeholders support these proposals: 2 (2%)
- Almost half the journeys made by road into the City at Rush hour are by cyclists: 1 (1%)
- If another cyclist dies on this route, TFL should be prosecuted for inaction: 1 (1%)
- In the last 3 years, 6 cyclists have died along this route: 1 (1%)
- It is essential that the CS2 has adequate capacity to cope with the existing flow of cyclists, and with growth in the future: 1 (1%)
- Support these proposals, do not water them down, improve them instead: 1 (1%)
- Take account of feedback from CTC also: 1 (1%)
- TFL Finance and Policy committee: potential conflict of interest - cyclists should be better represented: 1 (1%)
- There will be a safe route from Central London nearly all the way to the Lea Valley Route for the first time: 1 (1%)
- Worked as a professional driver in this area for many years: 1 (1%)
3.5.2 Whitechapel Business and Traders Association UK petition against changes between Vallance Road and Cambridge Heath Road
The Whitechapel Business and Traders Association submitted a petition of 154 names. The “PETITION TO SUPPORT WHITECHAPEL BUSINESS AND TRADERS” had the proposition “Say NO to upgrades of the Barclays Cycle Superhighway between Vallance Road to Cambridge Heath Road”.

3.5.3 Repeated identical or very similar comments opposing the banned turns at the Mile End/Burdett road junction
22 of the responses from residents opposing the banned right turns at Mile End/Burdett Road were identical or very similar to the response ‘I object to the proposal of no right turn at the Burdett Road/Mile End Road junction because of the likely impact on traffic volumes on Roman Road and the surrounding areas.’ The differences included as ‘vehemently object’ or ‘strongly object’ for ‘object’.

We have counted these as direct consultation responses because respondents submitted their comments directly through the consultation website and sometimes commented on other aspects of the proposals.

If considered as a separate petition outside the consultation, the opposition to Section 5 from those offering open-ended comments in that section would be 10% rather than 12%. 
4. Conclusion and next steps

4.1 TfL’s response to consultation
Overall, 89% of direct respondents said they supported or partially supported TfL’s proposals for the Barclays Cycle Superhighway Route 2 (CS2) upgrade between Aldgate and Bow roundabout. Including the supportive template emails from the London Cycling Campaign, the support rate was 95%.

Having considered the issues raised in consultation, we will recommend that TfL Board agrees to proceed with the scheme with the following changes to the original proposals:

- Creating a 5 metre wide eastbound bus lane which will include a 2 metre wide mandatory cycle lane outside Whitechapel market to accommodate the specific needs of the market and its operation. We will maintain the existing inset loading bays and hours of operation. We will work with Whitechapel market traders to ensure that the bus lane and cycle track remain unobstructed along this section of the route. We will also use the existing bus stop designs in this location rather than bus stop bypasses, as the 5 metre bus lane leaves around 2 metres for cyclists to pass on the outside of buses. A drawing of the new design at Whitechapel market is available at [tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade](http://tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade)
- Where a side road or property access does not create a break in the kerb segregation to allow cyclists to enter and leave the cycle track before a bus stop bypass, we will create a break to allow them to do so
- Extending the loading bays outside Whitechapel Gallery to ensure that exhibitions and the deliveries and servicing of neighbouring local businesses can continue smoothly
- The 25 metre parking bay at Goulston Street will be changed to a loading bay to increase loading provision in the area and meet the requirements of local businesses
- Changes to the Barclays Cycle Hire docking station at New Road, including the removal of 10 docking points to leave 26 remaining
- We will need to remove approximately 20 smaller trees and 2 larger trees. This number has increased from 18 since consultation following changes to the design and further investigations. We continue to investigate how to minimise the loss of trees and we are looking for new locations to replace trees wherever possible
- Removing less pavement space in some areas, including outside Mile End station and west of Adler Street

There are no other significant changes to the proposals that were consulted on. TfL’s response to issues commonly raised is available in Appendix B.

4.2 Completion of CS2 upgrade between Aldgate and Bow roundabout
TfL will recommend to its Board that the CS2 Upgrade progresses to construction as proposed in the consultation documents, subject to the changes described above and a number of other minor design alterations. Subject to a final decision by TfL Board, we plan to start construction work in early 2015.

Construction will cause some disruption, although we will work to minimise the impact as much as possible. We will keep those customers and road users potentially impacted by
the construction activity informed of our plans and progress, including writing to local residents and businesses before undertaking work in their area. We will provide road traffic information to help them better plan their journeys and make informed choices about how, where and when they travel and help to reduce the possible impact to their journeys.
Appendix A: Detailed analysis of responses

Overall scheme: Aldgate to Bow Roundabout

Overview

Key proposals:
- Reallocation of some road space and pavement to create two-way segregated cycle track
- Redesigned junction layouts along the route to make them safer and more convenient for cyclists and pedestrians
- Banned turns for motorists at multiple locations, including Mile End Road to Burdett Road and Whitechapel High Street to Leman Street
- Changes to footways and pedestrian crossings
- Provision of bus stop and loading bay bypasses along the route
- Relocation of a number of bus stops and Barclays Cycle Hire Docking Stations

Number of respondents: 1455

Scheme support:

- Support: 78%
- Partially support: 11%
- No opinion: 1%
- Not sure: 1%
- Don't support: 9%

Of respondents giving text comments:
- 352 supported the overall proposals
- 97 partially supported the proposals
- 86 do not supported the proposals
Details of open-ended responses for overall scheme

Segregation: 89 respondents (6% of all respondents) referred to segregation.

Support
- Support segregation: 55 respondents (4%)

Opposition
- Segregation is dangerous: three respondents (<1%)
- Loss of traffic lanes unacceptable: three respondents (<1%)
- Segregation will lead to increased congestion for other road users: one respondent (<1%)
- Cyclists will ignore segregation and cycle on the main carriageway: one respondent (<1%)
- Danger of segregation for learners, slow cyclists and children: one respondent (<1%)

Section 4 unsegregated section
- Concern with unsegregated stretch of Section 4: four respondents (<1%)
- Greater focus and attention needed to ensure safety: one respondent (<1%)

Level of segregation
- More segregation required: four respondents (<1%)
- Segregation up to junction edges: one respondent (<1%)
- Dutch style segregation at all junctions: three respondents (<1%)

Cycle lane width
- Concern whether 2 metres is wide enough for safe overtaking: three respondents (<1%)

Other
- Angled kerbs needed for cyclist safety: four respondents (<1%)
- Cycle lanes on pavement rather than replacing traffic lanes: one respondent (<1%)
- Segregation extended to reach the Strand or Tottenham Court Road: one respondent (<1%)

Impact on bus services and general traffic: 51 (4%) respondents referred to buses, mainly on negative impact of the proposals on bus journey times.
- General delays to bus services: 25 respondents (2%)
- Increased congestion: 27 respondents (2%)
- Increased motor traffic delays outweighed by long term health and environmental benefits: three respondents (<1%)

Parking and Loading: 34 respondents (3%) referred to loading and parking.
Support

- Loading/parking bay bypasses: four respondents (<1%)
- Changing location of parking bays: three respondents (<1%)
- Consistency of loading bays: one respondent (<1%)
- Removal of parking: one respondent (<1%)
- Would improve existing situation: one respondent (<1%)
- Loading and parking changes would improve safety: one respondent (<1%)

Opposition

- Oppose reduced loading bay space: three respondents (<1%)
- Oppose sharing of loading bays with disabled badge holders: two respondents (<1%)
- Proposals negatively impact loading activities: two respondents (<1%)
- Concern about conflict, access and parking at Whitechapel market: two respondents (<1%)
- Oppose loading bay bypasses: one respondent (<1%)
- Oppose removal of loading bay eastbound in Section 4: one respondent (<1%)
- Conflict likely at loading bay bypasses: one respondent (<1%)
- Inadequate parking provision: one respondent (<1%)
- Oppose removal of coach parking facilities: one respondent (<1%, Whitechapel Gallery)

Other

- Concern how Whitechapel Market will operate without loading bays/limited alternative parking provision for market traders: four respondents (<1%)
- Unclear how market loading bays work: one respondent (<1%)
- Changing the parking and loading bay times to reflect traffic flows: two respondents (<1%)
- Loading bay times do not reflect traffic flow: one respondent (<1%)
- Enforcement to prevent parking on cycle lane needed: one respondent (<1%)

Existing Issues

- Existing problem of cars parking on cycle lane: four respondents (<1%)
- Adequate cycle parking needed: two respondents (<1%)

Pollution/environmental impacts: 26 (2%) respondents mentioned pollution and environmental impacts of the proposals.

- Proposals will increase pollution levels: 10 respondents (1%)
- Pollution increases as a result of increased congestion and less road space for vehicles: five respondents (<1%)
- Proposals will reduce pollution levels: seven respondents (<1%)
- More information on pollution impacts needed: three respondents (<1%)
- More should be done to tackle pollution: one respondent (<1%)
Bus stop bypasses: 24 respondents (2%) mentioned bus stop bypasses.

**Support**
- Support bypasses: five respondents (<1%)

**Opposition/concern**
- Potential for conflict between bus users, pedestrians and cyclists: 12 respondents (1%)
- General concern about use of bypasses: four respondents (<1%)
- Question bypasses high pedestrian activity areas: three respondents (<1%)
- Against bypasses: two respondents (<1%)
- Risk of overcrowding: two respondents (<1%)
- Unfriendly for blind and disabled bus passengers: two respondents (<1%)
- Unfriendly for older people: one respondent (<1%)
- Pedestrians will wait for buses in cycle lane: one respondent (<1%)

**Bypass design**
- 2m cycle lane width maintained at bypasses: two respondents (<1%)
- Bypasses too narrow to accommodate waiting bus passengers: two respondents (<1%)
- A fence or other form of physical barrier needed to prevent conflict: two respondents (<1%)
- Gentle angles at approaches: one respondent (<1%)
- Crossing points to access bypasses too narrow: one respondent (<1%)
- Comfortable and accessible waiting areas required: one respondent (<1%)

Traffic ‘wands’: 23 respondents (2%) referred to wands, with the majority against their use.

**Support**
- Support wands: two respondents (<1%)
- Prefer wands to kerb segregation: one respondent (<1%)
- Wands improve existing situation: one respondent (<1%)

**Opposition**
- Wands ineffective for cyclist safety: 10 respondents (1%)
- Wands not visible to motorists: two respondents (<1%)
- Feel vulnerable with wand segregation: one respondent (<1%)
- Prefer full kerb segregation: one respondent (<1%)
- Wands will be destroyed by motor traffic: one respondent (<1%)

**Other**
- Question if wand maintenance schedule has been considered: one respondent (<1%)
- Use of wands lacks continuity with the rest of proposals: one respondent (<1%)
Value for money/economic impacts: 22 (2%) respondents mentioned the economic impacts of the proposals.

Support
- Proposals are value for money: 3 respondents (<1%)
- Economic benefits for local businesses of more cycling: 1 respondent (<1%)

Opposition
- Proposals are a waste of money: 17 respondents (1%)
- Money spent provides benefits for a minority of road users: 5 respondents (<1%)
- Proposals will impact on business due to longer journey times and kerbside access issues
- Money is better spent elsewhere: 4 respondents (<1%)
- Costs too much: 2 respondents (<1%)

Cyclist, driver and pedestrian behaviour: 17 respondents (1%) mentioned road user (cyclist, pedestrian or motorist) behaviour

Cyclist behaviour
- Problem of current poor cyclist behaviour on route: six respondents (<1%)
- Proposals will not change cyclist behaviour: two respondents (<1%)
- Change in cyclist behaviour needed is too big for proposals to work: one respondent (<1%)
- Cyclist behaviour change difficult to forecast: one respondent, London TravelWatch (<1%)
- Addressing cyclist behaviour is more important: one respondent, Road Haulage Association (<1%)

Motorist/pedestrian behaviour
- Current motorist behaviour deters cyclists: one respondent (<1%)
- Increased wait time at pedestrian crossings will lead to risky behaviour by impatient pedestrians: one respondent (<1%)
- The London Borough of Tower Hamlets and the Metropolitan Police Service expressed concern about the potential for a rise in anti-social behaviour as a result of the removal or relocation of CCTV cameras through the proposals.

Speed limit: Three respondents (<1%) requested that the speed limit is reduced to further increase safety on the route. Two of these respondents (<1%) suggested that the speed limit along the route should be 20mph. The other argued that the existing speed limit should be actively enforced to ensure road safety.
Recurring themes across sections

A number of issues recurred in some or all of the individual sections of the consultation:

- Support for proposals in general
- Support for kerb segregation and believed wand segregation was an insufficient method of improving cyclist safety.
- Concern that banning turns will increase congestion on surrounding roads as vehicles are diverted
- Concern at the loss of traffic and bus lanes to facilitate segregated cycle lanes
- Concern at potential for conflict between bus passengers, pedestrians and cyclists at bus stop bypasses
- Concern at tree removal, with some saying that any removed trees should be replaced like for like

These and other issues are discussed in more detail in the relevant section of the analysis below.
Section 1: Aldgate to White Church Lane

Overview

Key proposals:

- Kerb segregated cycle tracks replace some pavement and some traffic lanes on Whitechapel High Street.

- Ungraded junction at Commercial Street/Leman Street, including a banned right turn from Whitechapel High Street into Leman Street and removal of one westbound traffic lane on Whitechapel High Street.

Number of respondents: 1118

Section support:

- 80% Support
- 5% Partially support
- 4% No opinion
- 1% Not sure
- 9% Don't support

Of respondents giving text comments:

- 177 support overall proposals;
- 39 partially support proposals;
- 54 do not support the proposals
Details of open-ended responses to Section 1

Of the 1,118 respondents who completed this section of the consultation, 270 (24%) provided relevant comments in the open text box.

The most frequently reported section-specific issues raised are below.

General support or praise: 59 (5% of all respondents to this section) respondents offered general support or praise.
- Generic support or praise (e.g. “Excellent”): 30 respondents (3%)
- Improves safety for cyclists: 17 respondents (2%)
- Proposals will encourage more cycling: 4 respondents (<1%)
- Improve congestion: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Will reduce the number of accidents: 1 respondent (<1%)

Segregation of route: 31 (3% of all respondents to this section) respondents referred to route segregation. The most frequently raised issues were:

General comments
- Support segregation: 16 respondents (1%)
- Segregation is an important step in improving safety for cyclists: 5 respondents (<1%)

Wands
- Against the use of wands: 3 respondents (<1%)
- Support using wands: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Prefer greater wand usage in place of kerb segregation: 1 respondent (<1%)

Extent of segregation
- Segregation should continue to the edge of junctions: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Segregation should be provided from the pedestrian crossing to the east of White Church Lane to the edge of this section: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Provide more segregation: 1 respondent (<1%)

Width of cycle lane
- Concern whether a 2 metre cycle lane is wide enough to allow safe overtaking: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Request for a wider cycle lane rather than a segregated one: 1 respondent (<1%)

Other
- Important that proposals continue west of Aldgate and CS2 needs to link with other cycle superhighways: 2 respondents (<1%)

Leman Street junction: 29 (3%) respondents made reference to the junction of Whitechapel High Street and Leman Street.
• Against or questioned banning the right turn from Whitechapel High Street onto Leman Street as inconvenient for local residents: 11 respondents (1%)
• Leman Street should be two-way for cyclists: 5 respondents (<1%)
• Leman Street pedestrian crossing is not on pedestrian desire lines, more potential danger if pedestrians choose to not use the crossing: 4 respondents (<1%)
• Concern about removing a westbound traffic lane on Whitechapel High Street: 3 respondents (<1%)
• Support early release for cyclists: 1 respondent (<1%)

Commercial Street junction: 23 (2%) comments address the proposals at the junction of Whitechapel High Street and Commercial Street. Key issues were:

Opposition
• Against ban on right turns from Whitechapel High Street to Commercial Street: 2 respondents (<1%)
• Oppose reduced parking and loading facilities near Commercial Street: 2 respondents (<1%)
• Concern about removing traffic lanes: 1 respondent (<1%)
• Opposed to narrowing the pavement: 1 respondent (<1%)
• Against increased pedestrian waiting times: pedestrians often don’t wait for lights to cross Commercial Street: 1 respondent (<1%)

Junction design
• Cyclists should be protected from westbound left-turning vehicles: 2 respondents (<1%)
• Not enough room for eastbound cyclists waiting to cross Commercial Street: 1 respondent (<1%)
• Early release box is required, as provided at Osborne Street: 1 respondent (<1%)
• Ensure motor traffic going east on Whitechapel High Street cannot turn left into Commercial Street across bikes continuing east on Whitechapel High Street: 1 respondent (<1%)
• Two-stage turns should be used at this junction: 1 respondent (<1%)

Support
• Early release lights: 1 respondent (<1%)
• Filtering for westbound and eastbound cyclists: 1 respondent (<1%)
• Improve existing situation: 1 respondent (<1%)

Commercial Street improvements
• Improvements for cyclists travelling north-south as well as east-west: 2 respondents (<1%)
• Improved cycle lane needed on Commercial Street: 1 respondent (<1%)

Commercial Road junction: 18 (2%) respondents mentioned the Commercial Road junction. Comments included:
• There should be greater protection for cyclists turning from Commercial Road onto Whitechapel High Street: 4 respondents (<1%)
• Against Advanced Stop Lines: 3 respondents (<1%)
• Request for upgraded cycle facilities on Commercial Road: 2 respondents (<1%)
• The proposals would improve the situation at this junction: 2 respondents (<1%)
• Cyclists being able to turn right onto Commercial Road is useful: 1 respondent (<1%)
• Concerns about the amount of space for cyclists turning right onto Commercial Road: 1 respondent (<1%)

Bus stop bypasses: 18 respondents (2%) referred to bus stop bypasses. Six respondents (1%) were in favour of bypasses, and 6 (1%) were against. Specific issues raised were:
• Concern about conflict with pedestrians and bus passengers: 7 respondents (1%)
• 1.5 metre cycle lane at bypasses is too narrow; 2 metres should be continuous throughout the section: 3 respondents (<1%)
• Conflict is likely due to pedestrians disregarding cyclists: 2 respondents (<1%)
• Clear marking should be provided at bypasses to avoid conflict: 1 respondent (<1%)
• Poor visibility around bends at bypasses due to bus shelters and waiting passengers: 1 respondent (<1%)
• Issues with design for visibility impaired pedestrians: 1 respondent (<1%)
• Gentler angles should be employed at bypass entrances and exits: 1 respondent (<1%)
• Lights that stop cyclists and allow bus passengers to cross the cycle lane should be provided: 1 respondent (<1%)
• Steps should be taken to ensure litter does not build up at bypasses: 1 respondent (<1%)

Traffic impacts: 11 (1%) respondents expressed concern that the proposals would increase journey times and lead to delays for motorists or bus passengers. 1 respondent stated that increased delays will increase air pollution along the route.

Loading bay bypasses: 6 respondents (1%) referred to loading bay bypasses, with 5 in support and one against. 1 respondent (<1%) requests that sufficient space is provided for loading at bypasses.
Section 2: White Church Lane to Cambridge Heath Road

Overview

Barclays Cycle Superhighway Route 2 Upgrade
Section 2 – White Church Lane to Cambridge Heath Road

Key proposals:

- Kerb segregated cycle tracks replace some pavement and 35m of bus lane on Whitechapel Road
- Upgraded junction at Vallance Road/New Road
- Separate traffic signal phases for cyclists and left-turning traffic on Whitechapel Road
- Deeper advanced stop lines, early releases and other provision for cyclists on Vallance Road and New Road
- One tree removed to accommodate cycle lane

Number of respondents: 1110

Section support:

Of respondents giving text comments:

- 117 supported overall proposals
- 44 partially supported proposals
- 54 do not supported the proposals
Details of open-ended responses to Section 2

Of the 1,110 respondents who completed this section of the consultation, 226 (20%) provided relevant comments in the open text box.

The most frequently reported section-specific issues raised are below.

**Whitechapel market proposals:** 49 respondents (4% of all respondents to this section) referred to the proposals near Whitechapel market.

**Concern over existing issues**
- Problem of market traders parking in the cycle lane while loading: 15 respondents (1%)
- Concern about market traders putting stock and rubbish in the carriageway: 5 respondents (<1%)
- Conflict between pedestrians and cyclists in the market area: 3 respondents (<1%)

**Opposition to proposals**
- Proposals will have adverse impact on the market, or lead to increased conflict with market traders and visitors, pedestrians and other road users: 6 respondents (1%)
- Question how market can operate following proposals: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Concern about future market servicing operations: two respondents (<1%)

**Support for proposals**
- Support market and cycle infrastructure co-existing: 2 respondents (<1%)

**Loading**
- Request loading is allowed outside the market: 4 respondents (<1%, all market traders)

**Segregation**
- Further separation required between the cycle lane and the market to avoid conflict: 4 respondents (<1%)

**Other**
- Cycle parking in the vicinity of the market: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Visibility problems caused by market stalls: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Attention to location of the bin store associated with the market, potential to spill into the cycle lane: 1 respondent (<1%).

**General support or praise:** 39 (4%) respondents offered general support or praise.
- Generic support or praise (e.g. “Excellent”): 17 respondents (2%)
- Would improve safety: 10 respondents (1%)
- Proposals will encourage more cycling: two respondents (<1%)
• Would improve congestion issues: two respondents (<1%)

**Segregation:** 25 respondents (2%) mentioned segregation, with key issues being:

**Support**
- Support segregation: 13 respondents (1%)
- Segregation important for safety: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Critical to avoid accidents: 1 respondent (<1%)

**Cycle lane width**
- Concern if two metres is wide enough for a segregated cycle lane: 2 respondents (<1%)
- 2.5m width allows safe overtaking: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Prefer a wider cycle lane rather than a segregated cycle lane: 1 respondent (<1%)

**Level of Segregation**
- Dutch-style segregation at all junctions: 2 respondents (<1%)
- More segregation where possible: 1 respondent (<1%)
- 1 respondent (<1%) feels that segregation is unsafe for cyclists.

**Wands**
- Wands are insufficient for safety: 5 respondents (<1%)
- Less comfortable cycling with wands than with full segregation: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Wands could be destroyed by traffic: 1 respondent (<1%)

**Bus stop bypasses:** 17 respondents (2%) referred to bus stop bypasses.

**Support**
- Support bus stop bypasses: 4 respondents (<1%)

**Opposition/concern**
- Against bus stop bypasses: 4 respondents (<1%)
- Concern about conflict with pedestrians and bus passengers: 3 respondents (<1%)
- Conflict is likely due to pedestrian disregard towards cyclists: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Against bypass outside Whitechapel Station due to high pedestrian footfall and number of bus passengers: 1 respondent (<1%)

**Design**
- Gentle angles at bypass entrances and exits: 3 respondents (<1%)
- 1.5 metre wide cycle lane at bypasses is too narrow for cyclists to pass each other safely: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Clear marking to avoid conflict: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Poor visibility around bends due to bus shelters and waiting passengers: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Issues with design for visibility impaired pedestrians: 1 respondent (<1%)
3 respondents (<1%) said they were in support of loading bay bypasses.

**Vallance Road junction:** 11 respondents (1%) referred to the junction of Whitechapel High Street and Vallance Road. Issues raised were:
- Improvements to north-south cycle facilities along Vallance Road are needed as the route is dangerous: 2 respondents (<1%)
- The stagger on the pedestrian crossing to the east of Vallance Road is long: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Hanging left to turn right is counter-intuitive: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Introducing phasing for cyclists here would lead to increased delay to the flow of traffic at a section where congestion is already an issue: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Junction is difficult to navigate at present for cyclists: 1 respondent (<1%)
- The curve of the eastbound cycle lane across Vallance Road and the merging of two lanes of traffic leaves cyclists vulnerable: 1 respondent (<1%)

1 respondent (<1%), writing on behalf of the Whitechapel Business and Traders Association UK, objected to the provision of a cycle lane at this part of Whitechapel High Street.

**Tree removal:** 8 respondents (1%) referred to the removal of trees.
- Against the removal of trees: 4 respondents (<1%)
- Important for lost trees to be replaced: 3 respondents (<1%)

**Journey delays:** 5 (1%) respondents referred to the proposals' impact on journey times.
- Proposals will increase journey times and cause further delays: 4 respondents (<1%)
- Phasing for cyclists at the Vallance Road junction will increase delays: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Worsen delays between Vallance Road/New Road and Cambridge Heath Road: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Reduce delays caused by collisions: 1 respondent (<1%)
Section 3: Cambridge Heath Road to Beaumont Grove

Overview

Key proposals:

- Kerb segregated cycle tracks and wand-separated cycle lanes replace some pavement and one traffic lane on Whitechapel Road and Mile End Road
- Upgraded junction at Cambridge Heath Road/Sidney Street, including separate traffic signal phases for cyclists and left-turning traffic on Whitechapel Road and Mile End Road
- Relocation of Barclays Cycle Hire docking station to the east of Sidney Street and to the east of Cleveland Way
- Removal of five trees

Number of respondents: 1106

Section support:

- 79% Support
- 6% Partially support
- 4% No opinion
- 2% Not sure
- 9% Don't support

Of respondents giving text comments:

- 90 support overall proposals
- 49 partially support proposals
- 36 do not support the proposals
Details of open-ended responses to Section 3

Of the 1,106 respondents who completed this section of the consultation, 188 (17%) provided relevant comments in the open text box. The most frequently reported issues are detailed below.

**Banned right turn from Whitechapel Road to Stepney Green:** 25 respondents (2% of all respondents to this section) referred to this banned right turn, with the majority (22/2%) against it.

The most commonly cited reason for disapproval was that banning the left turn would inconvenience local residents and increase traffic flows on side streets, particularly White Horse Lane. Specific concerns cited regarding the proposed right turn ban were:

- Inconvenience for residents: 6 respondents (<1%)
- Increased pressure and traffic flows on Whitehorse Lane and other side roads: 5 respondents (<1%)
- Increase congestion and delays on other roads: 4 respondents (<1%)
- Lack of suggested alternatives: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Reduces permeability for cyclists: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Problems for accessing the area, especially with the banned turn onto Burdett Street: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Creates problems for motorists and cyclists: 1 respondent (<1%)

2 respondents (<1%) suggested that the right turn should be permitted for cyclists.

**Segregation:** 24 respondents (2%) referred to segregation.

**Support**
- Support segregation: 7 respondents (1%)
- Segregation necessary due to speed of cars between Cambridge Heath Road and Cephas Avenue: 1 respondent (<1%)

**Opposition**
- Segregation leads to increased accidents: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Segregation can lead to an increase in accidents as cyclists wait on the inside of a left only filter lane at a junction: 1 respondent (<1%)

**Traffic ‘wands’**
- Wands are insufficient for cyclist safety: 4 respondents (<1%)
- Kerb segregation should be provided instead of wands: 2 respondents (<1%)

**Level of segregation**
- Dutch style segregation should be provided at all junctions: 4 respondents (<1%)
- More segregation needed in this section: 4 respondents (<1%)  
- Full segregation needed east of Cambridge Heath Road: 2 respondents (<1%) and drawings indicate there is space for this: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Use trees and rain gardens as segregation: 1 respondent (<1%)
Cycle lane design
- Reduced distance between the start and end of segregation at entrance to Anchor Retail Park: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Concern about width of segregated cycle lanes: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Segregated sections should continue to junction edges (for example at Cambridge Heath Road, Cleveland Way, Anchor Retail Park and Stayners Road), to increase cyclists safety: 1 respondent (<1%)

General support or praise: 22 (2%) respondents offer general support or praise.
- Generic support or praise (e.g. Excellent): 12 respondents (1%)
- Improves safety: 6 respondents (1%)
- Improve congestion: 1 respondent (<1%)

Loss of trees 18 respondents (2%) referred to the tree removal (a total of five trees are due to be lost in Section 3).
- Against removal of trees: 7 respondents (1%)
- Important for trees to be replaced: 6 respondents (1%)
- Cycle lane routed behind trees to avoid their removal: 3 respondents (<1%)
- Praise attempts to replace removed trees: 1 respondent (<1%)

Bus stop bypasses: 16 respondents (2%) referred to bus stop and loading bypasses. Specific issues raised were:

Support
- Support bus stop bypasses: 4 respondents (<1%)

Opposition/concern
- Against bus stop bypasses: 6 respondents (1%)
- Concern about conflict with pedestrians and bus passengers: 3 respondents (<1%)
- Issues with design for visibility impaired bus passengers: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Likely conflict due to pedestrian disregard towards cyclists: 1 respondent (<1%)

Other
- Gentle angles at entrances and exits: 3 respondents (<1%)
- Greater width needed for cyclists to pass safely: 3 respondents (<1%)
- Bypasses too short: 1 respondent (<1%)
1 respondent (<1%) supported loading bay bypasses, and 1 (<1%) opposed.
Section 4: Beaumont Grove to Westfield Way

Overview

Key proposals:

- Kerb separated cycle tracks and wand-separated cycle lanes replace some pavement on Mile End Road
- Upgraded junction at Globe Road that would remove one traffic land at White Horse Lane. Upgrades include deeper advanced stop lines and early releases for cyclists
- Relocation of Bus Stop C (Bancroft Road/Ocean Estate) 50 metres west of current location
- Loss of five trees
- Relocation of Barclays Cycle Hire docking station currently located outside Stepney Green station

Number of respondents: 1105

Section support:

- 76% Support
- 8% Partially support
- 4% No opinion
- 2% Not sure
- 10% Don’t support

Of respondents giving text comments:

- 69 support overall proposals
- 71 partially support proposals
- 40 do not support the proposals
Details of open-ended responses to Section 4

Of 1,105 respondents who responded to this section of the consultation, 183 (17%) provided relevant further comments. The most frequently reported section-specific issues raised are detailed below.

Shared cycle and bus lane: 37 respondents (3%) commented on the merging of the cycle and bus lane to the east of the junction of Mile End Road and Globe Road/White Horse Lane. All opposed it and many were concerned with greater safety issues for cyclists. Potential solutions to provide a segregated cycle track were:

- Grass area south of Mile End Road could provide space for a segregated cycle track: 7 respondents (1%)
- Extend bus lane operational hours to lessen conflict with other vehicles: 3 respondents (<1%)
- Remove some of the bus lane (merge buses with other traffic) to allow segregation: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Cycle lanes on bridges suspended above the pavement: 1 respondent (<1%)

Segregation
Alongside comments on the merged cycle and bus lane, additional comments on segregation were:

- Support segregation: 5 respondents (<1%)
- Support segregation at the junction of Mile End Road and Stepney Green: 1 respondent (<1%)

Traffic ‘wands’

- Wand segregation is insufficient: four respondents (<1%)
- Complete segregation is safer: one respondent (<1%)
- Against use of wands westbound after Harford Street: one respondent (<1%)

Cycle lane width

- Concern over whether cycle lane is wide enough for safe overtaking: one respondent (<1%)

General support or praise: 18 (2%) respondents offered general support or praise.

- Generic support or praise (e.g. “Excellent”): 12 respondents (1%)
- Improves safety: 5 respondents (<1%)
- Proposals will encourage more cycling: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Improve congestion issues: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Design well thought through: 1 respondent (<1%)

Globe Road/Mile End Road junction: 17 respondents (2%) referred to this junction.

- Better pedestrian crossing facilities needed: 8 respondents (1%)
• Important as many Queen Mary University students use junction to access Stepney Green Station: one respondent (<1%)
• Segregate up to junction edge: 1 respondent (<1%)

Existing issues
• Junction is dangerous for pedestrians: 7 respondents (1%)
• Unfriendly for cyclists: 3 respondents (<1%)

Other
• Lack of continuity east of Globe Road: 3 respondents (<1%)
• Against parking and loading bay removal between Globe Road and Bancroft Road: 1 respondent (<1%)

Harford Street: 17 respondents (2%) referred to Harford Street or the junction of Mile End Road and Harford Street.

Impact of banned right turns at Burdett Road
• Negative impact of banned turns on traffic flows on Harford Street and Ben Johnson Road: 8 respondents (1%)
• Increased traffic exacerbates existing congestion problem: 5 respondents (<1%)
• Concern on impact on schools near Harford Street: 4 respondents (<1%)
• Traffic travelling to Limehouse or Poplar from Whitechapel or Mile End or to Bow from Limehouse will now use Harford Street and Ben Jonson Road: 2 respondents (<1%)
• Concern that HGVs will use Harford Street as a cut through in place of Burdett Road: 2 respondents (<1%)

Impact on bus services
• Negative impact on the 339 bus route: 4 respondents (<1%)
• Negative impact on the 309 bus route: 1 respondent (<1%)
• 339 bus currently experiences difficulty on Harford Street, particularly around Dongola Road: 1 respondent (<1%)

Harford Street junction: Five respondents (<1%) mentioned this junction, with the key issues being:

Support
• Support junction improvements: one respondent (<1%)
• Support early release of cyclists: one respondent (<1%)

Opposition/concern
• Proposals would make junction unsafe: one respondent (<1%)
• Proposals will result in further congestion: one respondent (<1%)
• Westbound Advanced Stop Line not required: one respondent (<1%)

Other

- Segregate Mile End Road up to junction edge: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Straight-across crossing needed to improve safety: 2 respondents (<1%)
Section 5: Westfield Way to Merchant Street

Overview

Key proposals:

- Kerb separated cycle tracks and wand-separated cycle lanes replace some pavement on Mile End Road and Bow Road
- Upgraded junction at Burdett Road/Grove Road, including the ban of right turns from Mile End Road onto Burdett Road (and vice versa), separate traffic signal phases for cyclists and left-turning traffic on Mile End Road, deeper advanced stop lines and early releases for cyclists
- Relocation of Bus Stop C (Mile End Station) 40m east and Bus Stop E (Regent’s Canal) 20m west of their current locations
- Removal of one tree
- Relocation of Barclays Cycle Hire Docking Stations to the east of Regent’s Canal and to the east of Coborn Street

Number of respondents: 1141

Section support:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Partially support</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Don’t support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of respondents giving text comments:

- 66 support overall proposals
- 66 partially support proposals
- 124 do not support the proposals
Details of open-ended responses to Section 5

Of the 1,141 respondents who responded to this section of the consultation, 266 (23%) provided relevant further comments. The most frequently reported issues are below.

Banned right turns from Mile End Road to Burdett Road. 140 respondents (12%) opposed the proposed ban of right turns from Mile End Road onto Burdett Road and Burdett Road onto Mile End Road. Specific concerns were:

- Inconvenience caused for residents: 35 respondents (3%)
- Banned turn will result in increased traffic flows on other roads: 34 respondents (3%)
- Alternative routes are primarily smaller, residential roads: 20 respondents (2%)
- No suitable alternative route is available: 17 respondents (1%)
- Banned turn will result in increased congestion on other roads: 15 respondents (1%)

As outlined in Section 3.5.3, 22 of the responses from residents opposing the banned right turns at Mile End/Burdett Road were identical or very similar to the response ‘I object to the proposal of no right turn at the Burdett Road/Mile End Road junction because of the likely impact on traffic volumes on Roman Road and the surrounding areas.’ The differences included as ‘vehemently object’ or ‘strongly object’ for ‘object’.

We have counted these as direct consultation responses because respondents submitted their comments directly through the consultation website and sometimes commented on other aspects of the proposals.

If considered as a separate petition outside the consultation, the opposition to Section 5 from those offering open-ended comments in this section would be 10% rather than 12%.

General support or praise: 66 (6%) respondents offered general support or praise.

- Generic support or praise (e.g. “Excellent”): 17 respondents (2%)
- Improves safety: 4 respondents (<1%)
- Improve congestion: 2 respondents (1%)
- Environmental benefits: 1 respondent (<1%)

Regent’s Canal: 5 respondents (<1%) referred to the Regent’s Canal.

- Better connection needed between CS2 and the canal towpath (a major north-south route): 2 respondents (<1%)
- Issue of contra-flow cycling along the northern footway on Mile End Road between Whitman Road and Queen Mary University: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Support alternative access to the towpath from the university: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Against floating bus stop at Bus Stop E (Regent’s Canal) due to high pedestrian and cyclist flows and likely conflict: 1 respondent (<1%)
**Bus Stop C (Mile End Station):** 3 respondents (<1%) supported the relocation of Bus Stop C (Mile End Station) 40m east of its existing location. 2 respondents (<1%) expressed their concern regarding the potential for pedestrian-cyclist conflict if a bus stop bypass is employed at this location, given the high pedestrian flows and high number of bus users at this stop.

**Relocation of pedestrian crossing.** 2 respondents (<1%) opposed the relocation of the pedestrian crossing outside Mile End station, stating that pedestrians will cross informally and increase risk to themselves.

**Taxi rank relocation.** 1 respondent (<1%) (Licensed Taxi Drivers Association) objected to the relocation of the taxi rank currently next to Mile End Station.
Section 6: Merchant Street to Bromley High Street

Overview

Key proposals:
- Kerb separated cycle tracks and wanded separated cycle lanes replace some pavement and some traffic lanes on Bow Road
- Upgraded junction at Campbell Road, including deeper advanced stop lines and early releases for cyclists
- Upgraded junction at Fairfield Road
- Relocation of Bus Stop Y (Bow Road Station) 25m east of its present location
- Removal of six smaller trees and one larger tree
- Relocation of Barclays Cycle Hire Docking Station to the east of Wellington Way
- Parking and loading changes

Number of respondents: 1099

Section support:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Partially support</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Don't support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of respondents giving open text comments:
- 64 support overall proposals
- 34 partially support proposals
- 29 do not support the proposals
Details of open ended responses to Section 6

Of the 1,099 respondents who completed this section of the consultation, 139 (13%) provided relevant comments in the open text box. This is the lowest response rate for any of the sections of this consultation. The most frequently reported issues raised in relation to Section 6 are below.

General support or praise: 28 (3%) respondents offered general support or praise for the proposals for Section 6.

- Generic support or praise (e.g. “Excellent”): 12 respondents (1%)
- Improves safety: 5 respondents (1%)
- Proposals will encourage more cycling: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Improve congestion: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Environmental benefits: 1 respondent (<1%)

Segregation: 23 respondents (2%) mentioned segregation.

Support
- Support segregation: 5 respondents (<1%)

Opposition
- Segregation leads to increased congestion: 1 respondent (<1%)

Level of segregation
- Dutch-style segregation at all junctions: 3 respondents (<1%)
- Segregation required on eastbound carriageway at Bow Church: 3 respondents (<1%)
- More segregation required: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Asked what happened to segregation at St Catherine’s: one respondent (<1%)

Traffic ‘wands’
- Wand segregation is insufficient: 4 respondents (<1%)
- Wands less effective than kerb segregation: 2 respondents (<1%)

Other
- Question if 2 metre cycle lane width is adequate: 1 respondent (<1%)

Fairfield Road junction: 14 respondents (1%) referred to the junction of Bow Road and Fairfield Road.

Support
- Support proposals at this junction: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Support parking bay removal to facilitate left turning traffic lane: 1 respondent (<1%)
Opposition

- Increased wait times at the pedestrian crossing: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Proposals are overcomplicated: 1 respondent (<1%)

Other

- Question lack of Advanced Stop Lines: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Right turn to Bow Road for vehicles as well as cyclists: 1 respondents (<1%)
- Request right turn not opened to all traffic: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Segregate right up to the junction edge: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Island between left-turn lane and straight-on lane could be narrower on the eastbound approach to Fairfield Road, with the resulting additional space used to widen the island between the bike lane and the carriageway: 1 respondent (<1%)

Loss of trees. 8 respondents (1%) referred to the removal of trees (a total of 7 trees are due to be removed in this section).

- Against tree removal: 6 respondents (1%)
- Important for lost trees to be replaced: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Opportunity to add further trees along route: 1 respondent (<1%)

Relocation of Cycle Hire Docking Station: 1 respondent (<1%) opposed the relocation of the cycle hire docking station located east of Wellington Way, stating they supported relocating the Docking Station onto Wellington Way or onto Merchant Street close by the junction with Wellington Way.

Cyclist behaviour: 1 respondent (<1%) argued that the proposals will affect the safety of pedestrians as a result of current cyclist behaviour. They stated that segregation may lead to cyclists believing they have priority over pedestrians at all crossings and that the proposals need to consider a mechanism to address this.
Section 7: Bromley High Street to Bow Roundabout

Overview

Key proposals:

- Improvements to Bow Roundabout junction
- Kerb segregated cycle tracks replace some pavement on Bow Road
- Relocation of Bus Stop E (Bow Church) 50m east of its current location, to be combined with Bus Stop G (Bow Church).

Number of respondents: 1094

Section support:

- Support: 81%
- Partially support: 5%
- No opinion: 5%
- Not sure: 2%
- Don't support: 8%

Of respondents giving text comments:

- 74 supported overall proposals
- 24 partially supported proposals
- 34 did not support the proposals
Details of responses

Of the 1,094 respondents who completed this section of the consultation, 13% (147) provided relevant comments in the open text box. The most frequently reported issues on Section 7 are below.

**Bow roundabout.** Although not directly part of the proposals, 38 respondents (3%) referred to Bow Roundabout.

**Existing Issues**
- Concern that proposals ignore Bow Roundabout: 8 respondents (1%)
- Roundabout currently dangerous for cyclists: 7 respondents (1%)
- Roundabout direct barrier to cycling on this route: 1 respondent (<1%)

**Suggestions to improve safety**
- Route cycle lane over flyover to avoid cyclists travelling through the roundabout: 7 respondents (1%)
- Provide pedestrian crossing facilities at the roundabout: 4 respondents (<1%)
- Prevent cyclists using the flyover if no increased protection is provided: 3 respondents (<1%)
- Increase advance green lights length for cyclists: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Relocate the bus stop further away from the roundabout to allow buses to use the flyover: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Use Dutch-style segregation: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Connect CS2 and the segregated section that runs towards Stratford: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Convert the roundabout to normal junction with clear priority for cyclists: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Provide a pedestrian phase at traffic lights: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Reduce speed limit to 20mph: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Provide a separate bypass for cyclists: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Remove the flyover completely: 1 respondent (<1%)

1 respondent (<1%) stated that they have seen cyclists ignore red traffic lights at the junction.

**General support or praise.** 28 (3%) respondents offered general support or praise for the proposals.
- Generic support or praise (e.g. “Excellent”): 10 respondents (1%)
- Improves safety: 5 respondents (1%)
- Proposals will encourage more cycling: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Improve congestion: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Environmental benefits: 1 respondent (<1%)
Bus stop relocation

- Support relocation of Bus Stop E and merge with Bus Stop G: 7 respondents (1%)

Opposition

- Against removal of bus stop: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Inconvenience for local residents and McDonald’s customers: 1 respondent (<1%)

Other

- Allow buses to use the flyover, reducing traffic and safety issues at the roundabout: 3 respondents (<1%)
- Further relocate bus stop to facilitate this: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Longer merged bus stop given the high number of buses that travel on this route, and to reflect that this location is where driver changeovers occur, and as such buses often wait for long periods of time: 1 respondent (Tower Transit) (<1%)

1 respondent (<1%) suggests improved seating and litter facilities at bus stops to discourage antisocial behaviour.

Bus stop bypasses. 14 respondents (1%) referred to bus stop bypasses.

Support

- Support bus stop bypasses: 3 respondents (<1%)

Opposition

- Against bus stop bypasses: 1 respondent (<1%)

Concern

- Concern about conflict between pedestrian and cyclists: 7 respondents (1%)
- Concern about vision impaired and other disabled passenger access: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Conflict due to pedestrians’ disregard for cyclists: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Conflict due to cyclists’ disregard for pedestrians: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Safety issues of bus passengers or cyclists not paying sufficient attention: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Pedestrians will gather in the cycle lane whilst waiting for the bus: 1 respondent (<1%)

Bus stop bypass design

- 2 metre cycle lanes should be provided at bypasses: 2 respondents (<1%)
- Clear markings to show pedestrians waiting areas: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Proper signage to warn pedestrians of presence of cyclists: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Gentle angles at bypass approaches: 1 respondent (<1%)
- Better pedestrian crossing provision across cycle lane: 1 respondent (<1%)
Appendix B: Response to issues commonly raised

Response to issues on overall scheme

Mitigating the impacts of banned turns
We have maintained the vast majority of turns along the route. However, to minimise the impact on most vehicle journey times and to create room for segregated cycle tracks, we have banned four turns out of the 63 available at the 11 signalised junctions along the route. In each case, we thoroughly investigated and evaluated other options before banning turns.

We will use targeted email and publicity campaigns to provide drivers with information about new banned turns in advance of their implementation. These will include details of the banned turns and information. We will also install appropriate signage and mitigation measures to ensure drivers are aware of the banned turns. Our response to concerns about specific banned turns is shown under the relevant section elsewhere in this Appendix.

Safety for cyclists
Most of the respondents who commented on safety for cyclists said that they thought the CS2 upgrade would improve safety for cyclists.

We are determined to ensure London’s roads are as safe as they can be for cyclists. CS2 runs on a busy and intimidating road, but currently offers cyclists no physical protection from motor traffic.

Our accident data shows that there were 169 collisions involving injury to cyclists - 31% of total collisions in this area between July 2011 and February 2014. There were also three cyclist fatalities on the CS2 upgrade route in the same period.

The upgrade would include improvements that more closely follow the updated London Cycling Design Standards. We will closely monitor collisions involving all road users following completion of the upgrade.

Increasing numbers of cyclists
Some respondents said that they would start cycling on the CS2 route or cycle more frequently if they thought the route were safer.

The number of cyclists on CS2 increased by 32 per cent in the year after the route opened (TfL traffic counts, September 2010 - September 2012). At some points on the route, the average number of cyclists a day is around 2000 in each direction (TfL central cordon count surveys).

This upgrade will improve safety and convenience for these cyclists. We also expect the new cycle route would encourage many more people to cycle who currently feel unable to do so.

Concern over journey time impacts for general traffic and buses
Our traffic modelling of the journey time impacts shows that there would be longer journeys for motor vehicles at the busiest times of day on this route. The modelling methodology takes account of the combined impact of 21 road and cycling schemes
expected to be delivered by December 2016, in order to present an accurate picture of the expected effect on traffic across central and inner London. The model uses a technique called “traffic reassignment” which determines where traffic will go if road capacity is altered, if turns are banned or if changes are made to traffic signal timings. We have then looked in detail at changes in journey time to specific routes and journeys through the scheme area.

**General traffic**
Our data shows that eastbound journeys between Bow roundabout and Aldgate for general traffic would increase by a maximum of 39 seconds in the morning peak from the current base time of 11 minutes 21 seconds, and by 17 seconds in the evening peak from the current base time of 13 minutes 6 seconds. It shows that westbound journeys in the morning peak would increase by a maximum of 7 minutes and 7 seconds from the current base time of from 14 minutes 29 seconds and in the evening by 3 minutes 16 seconds, from the current base time of 14 minutes 47 seconds.

**Buses**
Our traffic modelling of the journey time impacts for the 20 bus routes that go through the scheme area shows that 7 journeys will be quicker by up to 1 minute, 4 journeys will be slower by 1 minute or less, 7 journeys will be slower by 1-2 minutes and 2 journeys will be 2-5 minutes slower.

The modelling data includes planned changes to traffic light timings which will help keep traffic moving. However, it does not include our other planned measures to manage traffic in London, including increased enforcement in areas at risk of congestion, influencing freight and servicing activity to reduce traffic volumes at busy times and locations, and improved driver information to enable more accurate journey planning. We expect that these measures will collectively have a positive impact on the predicted journey time changes.

More information on our traffic modelling is available at [https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/cycling/9ebaa28d](https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/cycling/9ebaa28d).

We acknowledge that some people will be concerned about the potential for longer journey times and we will work to mitigate the impact as much as possible, as outlined below. However, we have concluded that the impact on traffic is reasonable when balanced against the substantial safety improvements that the proposals would bring for the many cyclists who pass through the scheme area each day and the likely growth in cycling along this route, including use by people who would cycle if they felt it to be safer.

**Motorist journey time mitigation**
We are developing wider traffic management plans to help reduce the traffic impacts of this scheme and others, including those proposed by London local authorities and developers. This includes investing in advanced traffic signal technology to allow us to better manage traffic depending on differing conditions at any given time. There will also be customer information to enable road users to make informed journey choices and campaigns to encourage road users to check before they travel.

**Bus journey time mitigation**
Where there are increases in journey times for bus routes impacted by the scheme, a programme of work is being developed to save time elsewhere along the affected routes by addressing delays and giving priority to buses at certain pinch-points.
Concern over reduction in traffic and bus lanes
The scheme has been designed to provide a dedicated and convenient route for cyclists whilst limiting the impact on other road users. The proposals will remove only 0.125 km of bus and traffic lanes along the 4.6 km route at the following points:

- 30 metres of bus lane near White Church Lane
- 20 metres of bus lane near Cambridge Heath Road
- 25 metres of traffic lane near Stepney Green
- 50 metres of traffic lane between Commercial Road and Leman Street

Concern over changes to pavements
To make room for dedicated space for cycling while retaining enough provision for buses and general traffic, we need to reduce, change or remove some pavements, traffic islands and sections of central reservation.

- Reduced pavement width: While we recognise that some stretches of pavement on the route are busy, all footways on the route are a minimum width of 2 metres in accordance with TfL design guidelines. We will offset reduced pavement widths at some locations as much as possible by moving signposts, lamp posts, telephone boxes and other street furniture out of pedestrians’ way where possible. We will also create dedicated waiting areas for bus passengers at bus stop bypasses. These measures will allow pedestrians to move more freely along the pavement.

- Removal of central reservations: Because of the limited road space available, we will remove some central reservations. This allows us to remove less pavement and fewer trees in some places.

Changes to pedestrian crossings
Where possible, we will change the layout of pedestrian crossings and install the most appropriate crossing for each location given the road layout. We will also make the following changes at pedestrian crossings:

- Pedestrian countdown: We will introduce pedestrian countdown at 20 crossings along the route.

- Pedestrian wait times: These will increase by an average of 10-25 seconds. We will continue to review timings to see if there is opportunity to reduce this increase.

Concern about bus stop bypasses
Between May and July 2014, we conducted research on Stratford High Street on the CS2 extension to find out road users’ attitudes towards the bus stop bypasses that operate there. The survey showed 89% support from cyclists and 70% support from bus passengers and pedestrians. The vast majority of cyclists on Stratford High Street use the bus stop bypasses when there is a bus at the stop (92%) and also when there is no bus (86%). The main concern for cyclists was sharing space with bus stop users, but there was evidence that cyclists and bus passengers are looking out for each other to help prevent incidents. 77% of cyclists said that they slowed down and are aware of pedestrians crossing to/from the bus stop, and a further 15% of cyclists stop completely to allow pedestrians to cross. 91% of bus users wait for cyclists to pass before crossing.
Based on our research and the experience of other countries (International Cycling Best Practice Study), we consider bus stop bypasses to be a viable design option and we support their use at appropriate locations throughout London.

We will install bus stop bypasses like the ones that already operate between Bow Roundabout and Stratford. Cyclists will be directed behind the bus stop on a carriageway-level cycle track. Bus passengers can access a waiting area by crossing the cycle track using a raised, marked crossing point.

- **Potential for conflict between pedestrians and cyclists:** We have monitored bus stop bypasses on the CS2 extension between Bow roundabout and Stratford. Even when a bus was not at a stop, most cyclists used the bus stop bypass rather than move into the traffic lane. Pedestrians and cyclists also looked for each other to stop incidents occurring. There have been have been no recorded collisions at the bypasses since they were implemented.

- **Reduced pavement width:** We will need to remove some of the pavement to create space for the bus stop bypass and cycle track. However, bus stop bypasses give a dedicated space off the pavement for the bus sign and shelter and for bus passengers to wait, freeing the pavement for those travelling along it. We will maintain a minimum footway width of 2 metres throughout the route to allow everyone using the pavement to move as freely as possible. We also will move signposts, lamp posts, telephone junction boxes and other street furniture out of pedestrians’ way where possible.

- **Capacity in the bus waiting areas:** We counted bus passengers at the busiest stops and are satisfied that the 2.5 metre wide waiting areas are sufficient to safely and comfortably accommodate passengers.

- **Pedestrian guard rails:** Two respondents (<1%) suggest that a fence or other form of physical barrier should be erected at bypasses to prevent such conflict from occurring. However, we consider that guard rails at bus stop bypasses could present a hazard for cyclists and would clutter the footway. Therefore, no guard rail is planned.

- **Vision impaired and disabled users:** We are considering the London Visual Impairment Forum’s request to trial a pedestrian priority crossing (i.e. a small version of a zebra crossing). However, such a trial is dependent on the details of changes to regulations on crossings, which we expect the Department for Transport to publish in spring 2015.

We are satisfied from our off-street trials, research and monitoring of the CS2 extension between Bow and Stratford that bus stop bypasses are suitable for the CS2 upgrade and will help us to make cycling safer at bus stops. We will closely monitor bus stop bypasses following construction to ensure that they are operating as planned and so we can identify and address any issues that arise.

Under the 2010 Equality Act, Transport for London has a responsibility as a highway authority to provide a transport service that is accessible to everyone and make reasonable adjustments to remove barriers for disabled people. This applies to the street environment and to public transport services and covers disabled bus passengers, cyclists and pedestrians. Any change to the street environment, including those intended to make streets safer and more attractive for cyclists, must take into account the accessibility needs of all users. To help boost accessibility to transport for all Londoners, TfL has committed to making 95% of all bus stops accessible by the end of 2016.
Cycle track design

- **Traffic wands:** We will only use traffic ‘wands’ (regularly-spaced, highly-visible, flexible poles) where the road is too narrow to use kerb segregation. There will be gaps for side roads, junctions and access to properties. The wands are 0.7 metres high and have a reflective strip to provide a highly visible indication of the separation between the cycle track and the road.

- **Maintenance of wands:** We will maintain traffic wands as part of our inspection and maintenance programme on the Transport for London Road Network. Any defects reported to our Customer Services team (tfl.gov.uk/contact, tel 0343 222 1234) are investigated and where possible repaired within 24 hours.

- **Width:** The cycle track has been designed to accommodate large numbers of cyclists, with space to overtake wherever possible. Our current London Cycling Design Standards (4.2.7) says: “In order to allow comfortable use by cyclists, including those using trailers and cycles/tricycles used by disabled people, cycle lanes should normally be 1.5m wide, but 2.0m wide where space permits. A wider width will also allow a cyclist to overtake another slower cyclist without entering the main flow of traffic.”

- **Side roads:** Sections of the road raised to pavement level will slow vehicles turning into and out of side roads, making them less likely to cut across the path of a pedestrian or cyclist. Many cycle lanes are on the kerb side, meaning vehicles at side roads will be required to give way to cyclists and motor traffic on the main road. Following the implementation of CS2 upgrade we will continue to monitor the collisions to understand any patterns and mitigate if necessary.

- **Surfacing:** We are currently discussing how much blue surfacing to use on the cycle track and are investigating materials.

- **Angled kerbs:** We will use angled kerbs throughout the majority of the route to provide a sloped rather than a vertical edge between the cycle track and the pavement or segregating island. Cyclists can safely cycle closer to the kerb edge, maximising the effective width of the cycle track.

Junction design

We have used different road design measures to best suit individual site conditions at the 11 signalised traffic junctions on CS2 upgrade. These are in line with our new London Cycling Design Standards, which will be published shortly and closely follow international best practice. Measures will include:

- **‘Hold the left turn’:** when cyclists have a green signal, left-turning traffic will be held at red. Cyclists would then be held at a red signal while traffic is turning left. This would avoid one of the most common causes of cyclist deaths and injuries – conflict between straight-ahead cyclists and left-turning traffic

- **Deeper, 7.5 metre Advanced Stop Lines** will allow cyclists to wait ahead of traffic

- **Early release for cyclists** will give cyclists arriving at a red signal for all traffic their own green signal before traffic and buses to allow them to move more safely through the junction. When traffic has a green signal, cyclists would proceed with traffic. This design is subject to Department for Transport approval

- **Two-stage right turn facilities** will allow cyclists to turn right more safely. Right-turning cyclists would wait in a marked waiting area on the road to the left of the
cycle lane until they receive a green signal to cross the junction. This would remove
the need for right-turning cyclists to move across lanes of traffic. This design is
subject to Department for Transport approval.

- **Junction bypasses** for straight-ahead cyclists

In designing each junction, we have taken into account the number of motorists, cyclists
and pedestrians travelling in each direction, accident data and any trends since the launch
of CS2, and the available space. We have assessed how we can best meet the needs of
different groups of road users, residents and anyone passing through or using the area
while overcoming barriers to cycling.

**Cyclist and other road users’ behaviour**

TfL acknowledges concerns raised about cyclist behaviour, although our research shows
that most cyclists ride responsibly and are no more likely to disobey road rules than other
road users. Statistics on road traffic collisions in Greater London show the number of
injuries and fatalities for pedestrians in collisions involving cyclists are many times fewer
than those involving motor vehicles.

TfL promotes adherence to the Highway Code by all road users and encourages
‘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 education programmes, as
well as through marketing and engagement campaigns.

We recognise that some pavement cyclists break the law to avoid the dangers of motor
traffic. However, we anticipate that providing dedicated and safe space for cyclists will
discourage people from riding on pavements. Providing dedicated space for cyclists can
also help other road users by letting them know where to expect high volumes of cyclists.

TfL partially funds the Metropolitan Police’s Cycle Safety Team and are working on a
strategic enforcement plan, taking into account all activities. Any deployment will be
evidence driven. The Cycle Safety Team will patrol the Cycle Superhighway 2 upgrade
between Aldgate and Bow Roundabout when it opens, encouraging appropriate behaviour
by all road users and enforcing compliance.

**Removing trees**

We will have to remove approximately 22 trees along the route to construct the cycle track.
This number has increased from 18 since consultation following changes to the design and
further investigations. We have thoroughly investigated how to avoid cutting down trees
and will avoid doing so wherever possible. Where feasible, we have raised the cycle track
to footway level to avoid cutting the roots and removing the tree. We have also reduced or
removed central islands or reservations wherever possible to avoid the need to cut back
the footway and remove trees. However, we have decided that the substantial safety
improvements for cyclists justify the regrettable loss of some trees. We will replace as
many trees as possible and we are currently investigating new locations nearby.

**Concerns over value for money**

Some respondents questioned expenditure on this and other cycling schemes.

TfL identified a range of benefits, including to businesses, health, the environment, the
public realm, transport capacity, journey time savings, journey cost savings and safety that
would result from delivering the Cycling Vision portfolio, in addition to the traffic impacts and other disbenefits. These were presented to the TfL Board in February 2014.

Increasing the level of cycling in London to the Mayor’s target of 1.5 million journeys per day by 2026 is expected to generate over £183m of benefits per year as a result of reduced mortality (early death) alone. Reaching this target level would benefit London businesses by around £30m a year as a result of reduced absenteeism. A London School of Economics/British Cycling report in 2011 estimated that the cycling sector contributes around £2.9bn to the UK economy, equating to £230 per cyclist per year.

There is also a strong safety case for making these changes. Our accident data shows that there were 169 collisions involving injury to cyclists on CS2 - 31% of total collisions along the route between July 2011 and February 2014. There were also three cyclist fatalities on the CS2 upgrade route in the same period.

More financial information about the Cycling Vision Portfolio is available in the TfL Board paper from 5 February 2014.

**Improvements to connecting routes**
Some respondents asked whether we would improve routes that connect with CS2. We will consider these suggestions in future planning, but they fall outside the scope of this scheme.

**Concerns about environmental impact of proposals**
Having studied a range of potential environmental effects of the proposals, TfL does not expect a significant impact. Any localised changes to air and noise quality are expected to be minor, as relatively small predicted changes in traffic flows are spread across the road network.

**20mph speed limit**
We are reviewing the opportunity to implement a 20mph limit on specific sections of the Transport for London Road Network in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets. Any proposals to create a 20mph limit would be subject to consultation.

**Barclays Cycle Hire docking stations**
We will shortly apply to the London Borough of Tower Hamlets for planning permission for new locations for those docking stations which require relocation. These will go through a statutory public consultation.

**Concerns about freight deliveries**
In our ongoing discussions with freight stakeholders, we are still considering how we can best accommodate delivery requirements, especially to the pubs along the CS2 upgrade route which present particular challenges in delivery. We are still investigating design options and refinements, and there may be further changes to our designs following further engagement with freight stakeholders. We will publish any further changes to the design on the website at tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade
Response to issues for Section 1 - Aldgate to White Church Lane
Please see the first part of this appendix for our response to issues raised regarding the overall proposals.

Apart from the changes to our proposals set out in 4. Conclusion and Next Steps, we intend to complete Section 1 of the CS2 upgrade route largely in line with our consultation proposals, which you can find at tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade.

Banned turn and other changes at Leman Street
We need to ban the right turn at Leman Street to accommodate the new junction layout, which eliminates conflict and creates space for cyclists. By banning the right turn we can allocate another lane and retain capacity for straight-ahead traffic, which is the busiest movement.

The Leman Street junction was the site of a cyclist fatality in 2013 and TfL is committed to improving the design here. This includes segregated cycle tracks and separate traffic signal phases for cyclists and left-turning traffic, which would avoid one of the most common causes of cyclist deaths and injuries – conflict between straight-ahead cyclists and left-turning traffic.

Although we accept that this could cause some inconvenience for some motorists, we concluded that the overall safety benefits to approximately 2000 cyclists each day means that we should proceed with the changes. Our latest traffic counts show a maximum of 100 vehicles an hour making the right turn excluding cycles. Other routes are available for motorists who would previously have used this turn.

We are unable to include a cyclist early release on Commercial Street because doing so would mean taking away green light time from motorists which would have a negative impact on journey times on this and surrounding roads, including the inner ring road between Tower Bridge and Old Street.

Loading bay at Whitechapel Gallery
Following consultation with Whitechapel Gallery, we will maintain a loading bay outside the gallery and reduce it from 28 metres to 22 metres, rather than from 28 metres to 12 metres. We will create space for the extended loading bay by moving the pedestrian crossing west by 5 metres.

Response to issues for Section 2 - White Church Lane to Cambridge Heath Road
Please see the first part of this appendix for our response to issues raised regarding the overall proposals. Apart from the changes to our proposals set out in 4. Conclusion and Next Steps, we intend to complete Section 2 of the CS2 upgrade route largely in line with our consultation proposals, which you can find at tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade.

Whitechapel market
Following consultation with market traders, the London Borough of Tower Hamlets and comments from the public, we have altered our design of the eastbound cycle track that runs along the market. Instead of a fully segregated cycle track, we will build a 5 metre wide bus lane, which will include a 2 metre mandatory cycle lane. We will not change the existing hours of operation of the bus lane or parking and loading.
We will maintain the existing inset loading bays and hours of operation. However, we will still need to make a 30 metre reduction to the eastbound parking and loading to build segregation on the eastbound approach to the new junction layout at Cambridge Heath. We will also need to remove some of the footway between the back of the market stalls and the road but this will not affect the market electricity supplies or pitches.

We acknowledge that some cyclists might be disappointed that we are not providing segregation here. However, the market is an important part of the local community, with unique requirements, and so we have revised the design to balance the needs of all users of this busy area. The mandatory cycle lane and bus lane will improve upon the current provision for cyclists.

A drawing of the new design at Whitechapel market is available at tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade.

**Temporarily removing the pedestrian crossing outside Whitechapel station**

Crossrail will remove the pedestrian crossing at Whitechapel Station in 2015 when the station entrance is temporarily relocated to Court Street. A new crossing will be in place outside the new station entrance during this time.

**Response to issues for Section 3 - Cambridge Heath Road to Beaumont Grove**

Please see the first part of this appendix for our response to issues raised regarding the overall proposals.

Apart from the changes to our proposals set out in 4. Conclusion and Next Steps, we intend to complete Section 3 of the CS2 upgrade route largely in line with our consultation proposals, which you can find at tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade.

**Banned turn at Stepney Green**

We intend to proceed with removing 25 metres of one of the two existing eastbound traffic lanes and banning the right turn for motorists from Mile End Road into Stepney Green to make space for the cycle track. There is not enough space to provide a right turn lane, which means any right turning traffic would block traffic wishing to go straight ahead. This would cause unacceptable delays to a large proportion of the traffic at this location. We cannot maintain two lanes of traffic by removing the pavement because there are a number of trees on both sides of the road.

Although we accept that this could cause some inconvenience for some residents and potentially increase motorists’ travel time, we concluded that the overall safety benefits to approximately 1,000 cyclists each day and the majority of vehicles which travel straight ahead meant that we should proceed with the changes.

Our latest traffic counts show a maximum of 111 vehicles an hour make the right turn excluding cycles. We will also work to provide drivers with advance information to help them plan suitable alternative routes.
Response to issues for Section 4 - Beaumont Grove to Westfield Way
Please see the first part of this appendix for our response to issues raised regarding the overall proposals.

Apart from the changes to our proposals set out in 4. Conclusion and Next Steps, we intend to complete Section 4 of the CS2 upgrade route largely in line with our consultation proposals, which you can find at tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade.

Globe Road crossing
Some respondents suggested that a pedestrian crossing with traffic lights was needed at the junction of Globe Road and Mile End Road. However, a full crossing would cause significant traffic delays on the A11 and on the neighbouring side roads.

Unsegregated section east of White Horse Lane
Unfortunately the road here is not wide enough to accommodate a cycle lane, a bus lane and general traffic lane. To maintain bus journey time reliability, cyclists will need to merge into the bus lane for approximately 70 metres. We will maintain 3 metre wide bus lanes through this stretch of road. We will use blue surfacing to indicate where the cycle track merges with the bus lane. Although using the land outside the Ocean Estate is outside the scope of the CS2 upgrade, we will discuss the potential for future highway widening and segregated cycle lanes with the London Borough of Tower Hamlets, the Ocean Estate and other interested parties.

Traffic on Harford Street
Some respondents suggested that the banned turn at Burdett Road would mean additional traffic on Harford Street. We acknowledge these concerns and will monitor traffic in and around Harford Street and neighbouring roads and work with the London Borough of Tower Hamlets to understand and mitigate any impacts.

Response to issues for Section 5 - Westfield Way to Merchant Street
Please see the first part of this appendix for our response to issues raised regarding the overall proposals.

Apart from the changes to our proposals set out in 4. Conclusion and Next Steps, we intend to complete Section 5 of the CS2 upgrade route largely in line with our consultation proposals, which you can find at tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade.

Mile End Road and Burdett Road banned turns
Consultation respondents suggested changes and alternative layouts to the junction, including not banning the turns and different traffic lane arrangements. During our concept feasibility and design process, we looked at a number of different draft junction designs, including layouts similar to those suggested by consultation respondents. However, the proposed layout is the only one that would minimise journey time impacts whilst delivering safety improvements for approximately 1,200 cyclists each day using the junction. By banning the right turn from Mile End Road into Burdett Road, we can allocate another lane and retain capacity for straight-ahead traffic, which is the busiest movement.

Our modelling and research showed that installing the new junction without banning turns caused queues of approximately 800 metres back to Cambridge Heath junction, affecting
all junctions in-between and potentially encouraging traffic to divert onto side roads. Banning these turns would reduce queues to approximately 130 metres. Our traffic modelling at https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/cycling/9ebaa28d shows the impact on journey times over the whole route.

At Burdett Road/Grove Road/Mile End Road junction 17 collisions involved cyclists, which was 37% of the total number, above the LB Tower Hamlets average of 20.4%. (Source: levels of collision risk in Greater London guidance).

We will work with the London Borough of Tower Hamlets and the Metropolitan Police Service to monitor road user safety and behaviour at Mile End/Burdett Road and along the whole upgrade route after construction to ensure that road users comply with the new road layout.

We understand the strength of residents’, businesses’ and stakeholders’ concerns regarding the banning of these turns, and that some motorists would be inconvenienced. However, we must consider this in the context of the overall feasibility of the scheme and the substantial benefits it would offer. We therefore consider that the improvements in cyclist safety and the reduced impact on journey times along the route on balance outweigh the potential inconvenience to motorists.

Relocation of the pedestrian crossing at Mile End station
We will relocate the pedestrian crossing at Mile End station to make space for the road layout. The crossing will be relocated 5 metres west and will be directly outside Mile End station.

Taxi rank at Mile End station
Given the current road layout, we have no option except to move the taxi rank outside Mile End station to a new location a short distance away on Mile End Road next to Maplin Street. We are discussing with taxi and private hire stakeholders how to ensure a clear and easy route from the station to the taxi rank for passengers.

Response to issues for Section 6 – Merchant Street to Bromley High Street
Please see the first part of this appendix for our response to issues raised regarding the overall proposals.

Apart from the changes to our proposals set out in 4. Conclusion and Next Steps, we intend to complete Section 6 of the CS2 upgrade route largely in line with our consultation proposals, which you can find at tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade.

Response to issues for Section 7 - Bromley High Street to Bow Roundabout
For overall issues raised, please see Appendix A: response to issues commonly raised.

Apart from the changes to our proposals set out in 4. Conclusion and Next Steps, we intend to complete Section 7 of the CS2 upgrade route largely in line with our consultation proposals, which you can find at tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade.
Future changes at Bow roundabout

Although Bow roundabout is outside the scope of the CS2 upgrade, we recognise the importance and urgency of improving facilities for road users in this area and will begin consultation early in 2015 on proposals to provide signalised crossings at the roundabout by mid-2016. In the longer term, we will work closely with the London Borough of Tower Hamlets, and other stakeholders of the Bow Vision Working Group to deliver the Vision for Bow: a place which all road users find accessible, safe and connected.

Removal of bus stop

We are removing bus stop Bow Flyover (M) because it is currently not heavily used compared to other stops on the route, with less than 200 bus passengers passing through during the two peak hours.

We are investigating whether it is feasible for buses to use the flyover.
Appendix C: Consultation leaflet

Have your say
on upgrades to the Barclays Cycle Superhighway between Aldgate and Bow roundabout, featuring safety improvements for cyclists
Consultation closes 2 November 2014

TfL is developing wider traffic management plans to help reduce the traffic impacts of this scheme and others, including those proposed by London local authorities and developers. This will include investing in advanced traffic signal technology to allow us to better manage traffic depending on differing conditions at any given time. There will also be customer information to enable road users to make informed journey choices and campaigns to encourage road users to check before they travel.

Is this linked to works at Aldgate and Bow roundabout?
The City of London is leading on a separate scheme to convert the Aldgate gyratory to two-way working, providing safe space for cyclists on Aldgate High Street, and to create a new public space. We are working in partnership with the London Boroughs of Tower Hamlets and Newham and other key stakeholders to deliver the Vision for Bow, to transform the Bow roundabout junction into a place which all road users will find accessible, safe and connected. We will consult on our proposals this winter.

Construction work
We plan to start construction work in early 2015. Construction would cause some disruption, although we would work to minimise the impact as much as possible. We would write to local residents and businesses before undertaking work in their area.

How do I view the detailed proposals and have my say?
The consultation runs until Sunday 2 November 2014. Depending on the outcome, we hope to begin work early in 2015. You can view and comment on detailed proposals and other supporting information at tfl.gov.uk/cycleupgrade by 2 November 2014. You can also visit our public exhibitions or request paper copies of the proposals and a postal response form (see the back of this leaflet for full details).
Cycle Superhighway 2 Upgrade

Response to Consultation

The City of London is leading on a separate scheme to connect the Aldgate gyratory to two-way working, providing safe space for cyclists on Aldgate High Street, and to create a new public space.

We are working in partnership with the London Boroughs of Tower Hamlets and Newham and other key stakeholders to deliver the Vision for Bow to transform the Bow roundabout junction into a place which all road users will find accessible, safe and connected. We will consult on our proposals this winter.

Construction work

We plan to start construction work in early 2015. Construction would cause some disruption, although we would work to minimise the impact as much as possible. We would liaise to local residents and businesses before undertaking work in their area.

How do I view the detailed proposals and have my say?

The consultation runs until Sunday 2 November 2014. Depending on the outcome, we hope to begin work early in 2015. You can view and comment on detailed proposals and other supporting information at tf.gov.uk/cycleupgrade by 2 November 2014. You can also visit our public exhibitions or request paper copies of the proposals and a postal response form (see the back of this leaflet for full details).

Barclays Cycle Superhighway Route 2 Upgrade

The map shows some of the main changes proposed along the route. For detailed proposals, visit tf.gov.uk/cycleupgrade.
Barclays Cycle Superhighway between Aldgate and Bow roundabout
The consultation closes on 2 November 2014.

Have your say at:
• tfl.gov.uk/cycleupgrade

Public exhibitions at:
• Queen Mary, University of London, Library Square
  Mile End Road, London E1 4NS
  Wednesday 24 September 1100-1400
• Idea Store Whitechapel, 1a
  321 Whitechapel Road, London E1 6BJ
  Saturday 27 September 1100-1500
  Tuesday 7 October 1500-1900
  Friday 10 October 1000-1400

Please see tfl.gov.uk/cycleupgrade for more information about these events.

Paper copies of plans and response forms are available by writing to FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATIONS or calling 0345 222 1254.

Map of leaflet distribution area
Appendix D: Consultation emails

Email to stakeholders

An email was sent to over 700 stakeholders potentially affected by the route. The email text is reproduced below, with the names of the stakeholders listed on page 78.

Dear stakeholder

Transport for London would like your views on proposals to upgrade Barclays Cycle Superhighway Route 2 between Aldgate and Bow roundabout. We would create kerb and wand-separated cycle tracks along the whole route and new junctions to separate cyclists from other traffic. The proposals have been designed to improve safety and comfort for cyclists.

View the proposals and have your say

Please visit tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade to see details of the proposed route and have your say by Sunday 2 November 2014.

About the proposed new route

The new route would mean some substantial changes to the road layout to create space for cycling improvements between Aldgate and Bow roundabout, including:

- Kerb and ‘wand’-separated cycle tracks
- Two new types of junction design along the route to remove or reduce conflict between cyclists and left-turning vehicles
- Bus stop bypasses directing cyclists behind the bus stop on a carriageway-level cycle track
- Combining some bus stops which are close together
- Reduced footway width in some areas to make room for the cycle track
- Increased space between the footway and the road
- Removal of around 20 trees (these would be replaced where possible)
- Four banned turns for motorists
- Changes to parking and loading (around 90% retained, but with some operating for less of the day)
- Reallocation of 0.125 km of traffic lane to cyclists along the 4.6 km route
- Journey time impacts for some other road users

Please visit tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade for more information and to have your say.

Public exhibitions

We invite you to one of our public exhibitions where you can view the proposals and speak to members of the project team:

Queen Mary, University of London, Library Square, Mile End Road, London E1 4NS

- Wednesday 24 September, 1100-1400
- Idea Store Whitechapel, Lab 1a, 321 Whitechapel Road, London E1 1BU
- Saturday 27 September, 1100-1500
Construction work

Subject to the outcome of this consultation, we plan to start construction work in early 2015. Construction would cause some local disruption, although we would work to minimise the impact as much as possible. We would write to local residents before undertaking work in their area.

Paper copies of plans and response forms are available by writing to FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATIONS or calling 0343 222 1234.

For more information, please visit [tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade](http://tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade).

Yours faithfully

Matthew Moore
Consultation Team
Surface Transport
Transport for London

Email to individuals registered on TfL database

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to let you know that Transport for London would like your views on proposals to upgrade the existing Barclays Cycle Superhighway Route 2 (CS2) between Aldgate and Bow roundabout.

The proposals would mean substantial changes to the road layout including a segregated cycle track to separate cyclists from other traffic, designed to offer safety for cyclists. To make room for the cycle track, we would reduce the width of the pavement in certain areas and change the operation of some junctions, including banning some turns for motorists.

For full details and to have your say, please visit [tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade](http://tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade)

The consultation closes on Sunday 2 November 2014.

Yours sincerely,

Nigel Hardy
Road Space Management Sponsorship
Email to stakeholders about additional information on traffic impacts

Dear stakeholder

I am writing to let you know that we have added information to the consultation website at tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade. The new information summarises how different road users could be impacted by the proposals and includes predicted changes to journey times on routes through the proposed scheme area based on our latest traffic modelling. The information is available here.

Please tell us your views on the proposed route by Sunday 2 November by visiting tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade.

Yours faithfully

Peter Bradley
Head of Consultation
Surface Transport
Transport for London

Email to consultation respondents following publication of additional information on traffic impacts

Dear Sir or Madam

Thank you for replying to our consultation on the proposed upgrade to Barclays Cycle Superhighway Route 2. I am writing to let you know that we have added information to the consultation website at tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade summarising how different road users could be impacted by the proposals. This includes a summary of predicted changes to journey times on routes through the proposed scheme area, based on our latest traffic modelling. This information is available here.

If you want to change or add to any part of your response based on this information, please let us know by visiting this website. The deadline for comments is Sunday 2 November 2014.

Yours faithfully

Matthew Moore
Consultation Team
Surface Transport
Transport for London
**Appendix E: List of stakeholders emailed**

| Abbey Mills Pumping Station | Baker Street Quarter |
| Three Mills Residential Moorings | Bangabandhu Primary |
| 14 Bike Co | Bangladeshi Youth Movement |
| 3663 First for Foodservice | Bar School |
| 4th floor studio | Barking and Dagenham |
| A Home From Home | Bayswater BID |
| A New Direction London Ltd | Beatrice Tate School |
| AA | Ben Jonson Primary |
| AA Motoring Trust | Beside |
| AA motoring Trust | Best Bike Training /Cycletastic |
| Abbey Gardens | Bethnal Green Meeting House United |
| Abbey Lane Gas Depot | Reformed Church |
| Abellio West London Ltd t/a Abellio Surrey, Ability Bow | Bethnal Green Methodist Church |
| Account 3 (Women’S Consultancy Service) | Better Bankside |
| Acrise Freight Depot | Bexley Accessible Transport Scheme, |
| Action for Blind People | Bexley Council |
| Action on Hearing Loss (formerly RNID) | Bexleyheath BID |
| Action on Hearing Loss (RNID) | bhs bikeability |
| Age Concern London | bidvest logistics |
| Age Concern Tower Hamlets | Big Hat Cycles |
| Age UK | Bike Shack |
| Age UK London | bikeworks |
| Age Uk Newham | bikeXcite |
| Alice Model | Bishop Challloner Catholic |
| Alive in Space Landscape and Urban Design Studio | Blind Beggar |
| All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group | Blue Triangle Buses Ltd, |
| All Saints Church | Bonner Primary |
| Alpha Grove | Borough Cycling Officers Group |
| Altab Ali Park | Bow Arts |
| Alternative Arts | Bow Arts Trust |
| Anderson Travel Ltd, | Bow Baptist Church |
| Angel BID | Bow Futures contacts |
| APC-Overnight | Bow Police Station |
| Argall BID | Bow Road Methodist Church With Holy Trinity All Hallows |
| Argos | Bow School |
| Arriva Kent Thameside/Kent & Sussex, Arriva Guildford & W Sussex, Arriva London North Ltd, Arriva The Shires/ E Herts and Essex, Asian Deaf Women’S Association | Brady Centre |
| Asian Peoples Disabilities Alliance | Breakspear`s Road Project |
| Association of British Drivers | Brentwood Community Transport, |
| Association of Car Fleet Operators | Brewery Logistics Group |
| Association Of Martial Arts | Brick Lane Bikes |
| Association of Town Centre Management | Brick Lane Jamme Masjid |
| aswaston - superdrug | British Cycling |
| ATCoaches t/a Abbey Travel, Aya Sofia Primary | British Land |
| | British Medical Association |
| | British Motorcycle Federation |
| | British Motorcyclists Federation |
| | British Retail Association |
| | British School of Cycling |
Bromley By Bow Centre Health Trainers
Bromley By Bow Church In The Community
Bromley By Bow Community Organisation
Bryant Street Methodist Church
BT
Bucks Cycle Training
Business B Ltd t/a The Expeditional,
Business Junction
Butley Court Community Centre
Buzzlines,
CABE - Design Council
Calcutta House
Camden Council
Camden mobility forum
Camden Society
Camden Town Unlimited
Campaign for Better Transport
Campbell's
Canal Club
Canary Wharf Management Ltd
Canon Barnett Primary School
Campaign for Better Transport
Capital City School Sport Partnership
Carousel Buses Ltd
Carpenters And Docklands Centre
Carpenters Primary School
CBI-London
CCG NHS Central London
Centaur Overland Travel Ltd,
Central Foundation
Central London Cab Trade Section
Central London CTC
Central London Forward
Central London Freight Quality Partnership
Central London NHS Trust
Centre for Accessible Environments
CET primary
Chalkwell Garage & Coach Hire Ltd,
Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport
Children'S House
Chisenhale Gallery
Christopher Stephen Hunn t/a Travel with Hunny/TWH,
Church Of Christ & St John
City Bikes (Vauxhall Walk)
City Hall
City link
City Of London
City of London Access Forum
City of London Police
City of Westminster
Clays Lane Ladies Club
Climate Centre
Coborn Arms
Cobra Corporate Services Ltd,
College Of East London
Community Transport Association
Confederation of British Industry (CBI)
Confederation of Passenger Transport
Confederation of Passenger Transport UK
Council Of Mosques
Covent Garden Market Authority
Cross River Partnership
Croydon
Croydon Coaches (UK) Ltd t/a Coaches Excetera,
Croydon mobility forum
CT Plus Ltd t/a Hackney Community Transport,
CTC
Cubitt Town Youth Project
Currys
Cycle Confidence
Cycle Confident
Cycle Experience
Cycle Newham
Cycle Surgery
Cycle Systems
Cycle Training East
Cycle Training UK (CTUK)
Cyclelyn
Cycle-wise Thames Valley
Cycling Embassy of Great Britain
Cycling Tuition
cycling4all
Cyclists in the City
Daly Fiona
Darul Arqam
Darul Ummah Mosque
Department for Transport
Department of Transport
Design for London
DHL
DHL Express
DHL UK & Ireland
Disability Alliance
Disability Coalition Tower Hamlets
Disability Information Training Opportunity
Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee
DLR
Docklands Business Club and East London Chamber of Commerce
E Clarke & Son (Coaches) Ltd, t/a Clarke of London,
E1 Cycles
E11 BID (Leytonstone)
Ealing Broadway BID
Ealing Council
East and South East London Thames Gateway Transport Partnership
East End Walks (Historical Walking Tours)
East London Bus Group
East London Central Synagogue
East London Centre
East London Chamber Of Commerce
East London Mosque
East London Tabernacle Baptist Church
East Surrey Rural Transport Partnership t/a Polestar Travel
East Thames Group
EDF Energy
Edgware Road Partnership
Emergency Services
Enfield
Enfield Council
English Heritage
English Heritage - London
Ensign Bus Company Ltd,
Epainos Ministries (New Testament Church Of God)
Epilepsy Action
Evolution Cycle Training
Express Network Forum
Federation of Small Businesses
First Beeline Buses Ltd,
Fitzrovia Partnership
Fountain Of Blessings And Miracle Church
Francis Lee Community Centre
Freight Transport Association
Friends of the Earth
Future Inclusion
G4S
Garratt Business Park (Earlsfield)
Garrett Centre
Gateway Housing
Gatwick Flyer Ltd,
General Auto Services
Glamis Estate Tenants’ Hall
Go-Coach Hire Ltd
Golden Tours (Transport) Ltd,
Institution of Civil Engineers
inStreatham
Interlink College Of Technology
Island House Community Centre
Islington Council
Islington mobility forum
J Brierley & E Barvela t/a Snowdrop Coaches
Jagonari
James Bikeability
Jeremy Reese t/a The Little Bus Company,
John F Kennedy School
John Lewis Partnership
John Orwell Sports Centre
John Scurr Community Centre
Joint Committee on Mobility of Blind and Partially Sighted People
Joint Mobility Unit
K&C mobility forum
Keith Gould
Keltbray ltd (construction)
Kesslers International
Kimpton Industrial Park (Sutton)
Kingsley Hall Community Centre
Kingston First
Kingston mobility forum
laing o' rourke
Lambeth Cyclists
Lansbury Harca Community Centre
LAP5 Steering Group
LB Barking & Dagenham
LB Barnet
LB Bexley
LB Brent
LB Bromley
LB Camden
LB Croydon
LB Ealing
LB Enfield
LB Hackney
LB Hammersmith & Fulham
LB Harrow
LB Havering
LB Hillingdon
LB Hounslow
LB Islington
LB Lambeth
LB Lewisham
LB of Sutton
LB Redbridge
LB Richmond
LB Southwark
LB Sutton
LB Tower Hamlets
LB Waltham Forest
LB Wandsworth
LCC
Lea River Park Project
Lee Valley Park
Left Hook Boxing Gym
Legal Advice Centre
Leonard Cheshire Disability
Lewisham Council
Licensed Private Hire Car Association (LPHCA)
Line Line Coaches (TGM),
Living Streets
Living Streets - Brentwood
Living Streets - Hackney
Living Streets - Islington
Living Streets - Kings Cross (Camden)
Living Streets - Merton
Living Streets - Sutton
Living Streets - Tower Hamlets
Living Streets - Wandsworth
Living Streets Action Group
Living Streets London
Living Streets Southwark
Living Strets
Local Government Ombudsman
London Academy Business School
London ambulance Service
London Bike Hub
London Borough of Barking & Dagenham
London Borough of Barking and Dagenham
London Borough of Barnet
London Borough of Bexley
London Borough of Brent
London Borough of Bromley
London Borough of Camden
London Borough of Croydon
London Borough of Ealing
London Borough of Enfield
London Borough of Greenwich
London Borough of Hackney
London Borough of Hammersmith
London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham
London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham
London Borough of Haringey
London Borough of Harrow
London Borough of Havering
London Borough of Hillingdon
London Borough of Hounslow
London Borough of Islington
London Borough of Kingston Upon Thames
London Borough of Lambeth
London Borough of Lewisham
London Borough of Merton
London Borough of Newham
London Borough of Redbridge
London Borough of Richmond upon Thames
London Borough of Southwark
London Borough of Sutton
London Borough of Tower Hamlets
London Borough of Waltham Forest
London Borough of Wandsworth
London Borough of Westminster
London Cab Drivers' Club Ltd
London Central Cab Section
London Chamber of Commerce
London Chamber of Commerce and Industry (LCCI)
London City Airport
London Climate Change Partnership
London Councils
London Cycling Campaign
London Cycling Campaign (Lewisham)
London Cycling Campaign (Tower Hamlets)
London Duck Tours Ltd
London East Academy
London European Partnership for Transport
London Executive Offices
London Fields Cycles
London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority
London Fire Brigade
London First
London General
London Independent Hospital
London Jewellery School
London Mencap
London Met University
London Older People’s Strategy Group
London Private Hire Board
London Riverside (Rainham)
London Strategic Health Authority
London Suburban Taxi Drivers’ Coalition
London Taxi Drivers’ Club
London Tourist Coach Operators Association (LTCOA)
London TravelWatch
London Underground
London United Busways Ltd.
London Visual Impairment Forum
LoveWimbledon BID
Malmesbury Primary School
Marner Primary
Marshalls Coaches,
Mazahirul Uloom London
Merton Council
Metrobus Ltd,
Metroline Ltd
Metropolitan Police
Metropolitan Police - Community Police
Metropolitan Police Service
metropolitan Police Service
Mile End Ecology Pavilion
Mile End Old Town Residents Association
Mile End Residents Association
Mile End Residents associations
MIND
Mind in Stratford
MIND in the Tower Hamlets
Mobile Cycle Training Service
Mode Transport
Motorcycle Action Group
Motorcycle Action Group (MAG)
Motorcycle Industry Association
Mulberry School For Girls
Mullany’s Coaches,
National Autistic Society
National Children's Bureau
National Express Ltd
National Grid
National Grid
National Grid - electricity
National Motorcycle Council
Netwalking (Tower Hamlets walking group)
New Addington BID
New Heart for Bow
New West End Company (NWEC)
Newham Asian Women’S Project
Newham Association Of Disabled People
Newham Citizen Advice Bureau
Newham Cycling Campaign
Newham Elderly Punjabi Involvement Unit
Newham Further Education College
Newham Healthy Living Network
For Older People And Carers
Newham Link
Newham Pensioner’s Forum
Newham Primary Care Trust
Newham Safer Transport Team
Newham Somali Education Association; Cultural Association
Newham Striders And Ramblers
Newham Voluntary Association For The Blind
Newtec (Early Years Nursery) Deansy Road
Newtec East London Child Care Institute Mark Street
NHS London
NHS Tower Hamlets CCG
Northbank Guild
Ocean Estate Tenants And Leaseholders Association
Ocean Estate Tenants Association
Ocean Somali Community Association
Ocean Sure Start
Ocean Youth Connexions
Old Ford Housing Association
Old Palace
Olga Primary
Olympus Bus & Coach Company
t/a Olympian Coaches,
On Your Bike Cycle Training
One World Foundation Africa
Orpington 1st
Osmani Primary
Outreach And Lifeskills
Oxford House
Oxford Tube (Thames Transit),
Paddington
Painted Children (Charity)
Parcel Force
Parliamentary Advisory Council for
Transport Safety (PACTS)
Passenger Focus
philip kemp cycle training
Pillar Box Montessori Nurseries
Planning Design
Police
Poplar And Limehouse Health Trainers
Poplar, Blackwall And District Rowing Club
Porcellio Ltd t/a Meridian Duck Tours,
Port of London Authority
Premium Coaches Ltd,
Prime Time Recruitment
Private Hire Board
Purple Parking Ltd,
Puzzle Focus Ltd
Queen Mary University of London
Queen Mary, University Of London
R Hearn t/a Hearn’s Coaches,
RAC
RAC Foundation for Motoring
Rachel Keeling Nursery
RADAR London Access Forum
Railway Tavern
RB Greenwich
RB Kensington & Chelsea
RB Kingston
Red Rose Travel
Redbridge Cycling Centre
Redlands Primary
Redwing Coaches (Pullmanor Ltd),
Refugees And Arts Initiative
Regional Waste Recycling Plant (Commercial)
Reliance Travel,
Renewal Refugee And Migrant Project (Ramp)
Resistance Gallery
Reynolds Diplomat Coaches
Rhythm Factory
Richmond Council
RMT Union
RNIB
RNID (Royal National Institute for Deaf People)
Road Danger Reduction Forum
Road Haulage Association
Road User Group
Roadpeace
Royal Borough of Greenwich
Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames
Royal Greenwich Cycle Training
Royal Institute of British Architects
Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors
Royal London
Royal London Cycle Training
Royal London Society for Blind People
Royal Mail
Royal Parks
Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI)
Sainsbury’s Supermarkets
Sarah Bonnell Comprehensive School
Sardar Ali Khan t/a Red Eagle,
SCOPE
Sense
Signs Of Life
Sixty Plus
Smithy Street Primary
Somali Bokol Province Relief Organisation
South Bucks Cycle Training
South East London PCT
South Herts Plus Cycle Training
South London Business Forum
South London Partnership
Southbank Employers Group
Southdown PSV Ltd,
Southgate & Finchley Coaches Ltd
Southwark Cyclists
Space syntax
Spokes Cycling Instruction
St Agnes
St Francis Rc Church
St George In The East
St James The Less Church
St John'S Parish Church
St Margaret'S House
St Mary And St Michael Primary
St Matthias Community Centre
St Pauls Church
St Peter’S Mission Hall
STA Bikes Ltd.
Stepney Green School
Stifflord Health Trainers
Stolenspace Gallery
Stratford Advice Arcade
Stratford Centre
Stratford Circus Performing Arts Centre
Stratford High Street Dir Station
Stratford Library
Stratford Renaissance Partnership
Stratford Station
Stratford Village Dental Practice
Streets Of Growth
Stroke Association
Subco (Specialist Service Provider For Asian Elderly)
Successful Sutton
Sullivan Bus and Coach Ltd
Sunwin Service Group
Sustrans
Sutton Centre for Voluntary Sector
Sutton mobility forum
Swanlea Primary
Taxi and Private hire
Taxi Rank & Interchange Manager
Team London Bridge
Technicolour Tyre Company
Terravision Transport Ltd / Stansted Transport Ltd,
Tesco
Tesco - Bromley by Bow
Tesco - Stratford
TGM Group Ltd
Thames Magistrates Court
Thames Water
Thamesmead Business Services
The AA
The Association of Guide Dogs for the Blind
The Automobile Association
The Big Bus Company Ltd,
The British Dyslexia Association
The British Legion
The British Motorcyclists’ Federation
The building Crafts College
The Canal & River Trust
The City of Oxford Motor Services Ltd,
The Ensign Youth Club
The Ghost Bus Tours Ltd
The Goose In Stratford
The Grumpy Cyclist blogger (Newham based)
The House Mill (museum)
The Kings Arms Guest House
The Kings Ferry Ltd,
The Licensed Taxi Drivers’ Association
The Old Town Hall Conference and Leisure Centre
The Original London Sightseeing Tour / London Pride Sightseeing Ltd,
The Owner Drivers’ Society
The Road Haulage Assoc. Ltd.
The Royal Parks
The Southwark Cyclists
The Space
Theatre Royal
Thomas Buxton Primary
Thomas’s London Day Schools (Transport) Ltd
Three Mills Green
Three Mills Studios
Time for Twickenham
TNT
Tower Hamlest Community Housing
Tower Hamlets Community Empowerment Network
Tower Hamlets Inclusion Support Centre
Appendix F: Campaign emails and petitions

The London Cycling Campaign (LCC) ran a campaign supporting the CS2 upgrade proposals. The text of the template email is below:

Dear Transport for London

Re: Proposals for the upgrade of Cycle Superhighway 2.

I am writing in support of the above proposals.

In the last 15 years, 8 cyclists have died along this route, the worst casualty record for any similar road in London. If no action is taken, and protected space for cycling is not implemented, I am gravely concerned that another fatality will be an inevitable consequence.

That’s a consequence that no person should have to face whilst using this road.

To ensure cyclists’ safety, I welcome the proposed implementation of the ‘hold the left turn’ design, which reduces danger of the infamous left-hook collision. I urge you though to take on board the detailed feedback from London Cycling Campaign and other cycling groups on the proposals.

I would also urge you to speak to London Borough of Tower Hamlets regarding a solution to the ‘missing’ part of CS2 by the Ocean Estate. It is essential that cyclists have protected space along the whole of this route.

I am aware that TfL has estimated the impact of the proposals on motor traffic, and understand that there will be traffic delays to some in the short term. However, improvements for cyclists on this route would bring immense benefits, including to the poor air quality currently affecting Mile End Rd; and the importance of improving safety on this route cannot be overemphasised.

Despite the poor infrastructure and hostile cycling conditions currently on CS2, the number of cyclists increased by 32% in the year after the route opened. Providing safe space for cycling along this route could mean it’s a viable option for thousands more who don’t currently feel able to cycle. Please make sure these plans are delivered, to ensure the safety of cyclists, and those who want to cycle, without delay.
Appendix G: Press release and media coverage

Press release
Text of the TfL press release publicising the CS2 Aldgate to Bow roundabout consultation can be found here:

Media coverage
Below is a selection of the media coverage highlighting the new route:

Broadcast media

BBC London
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-29336553

National and regional media

Evening Standard

Cycling and transport media

Bikebiz

Cycling Weekly

http://www.transportxtra.com/magazines/local_transport_today/news/?ID=39341
http://www.london24.com/news/cycling/25m_upgrade_to_prevent_more_deaths_on_cycle_superhighway_2_from_bow_to_whitechapel_1_3780818
Appendix H: Digital marketing assets

Multimedia text message

Have your say on upgrades to the Barclays Cycle Superhighway between Aldgate and Bow roundabout, featuring safety improvements for cyclists.

To view the proposals, go to tfl.gov.uk/cs2upgrade

Consultation closes 2 November

Online banner adverts

Have your say on upgrades to the Barclays Cycle Superhighway between Aldgate and Bow roundabout. Consultation closes 2 November 2014