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Executive summary

Between 8 February and 20 March 2016, we consulted on proposals to extend the East-West Cycle Superhighway from Paddington to Wood Lane. The aim is to provide a clearer and safer route for cyclists through west London - separated from other vehicles. We received 847 responses to our consultation, of which:

- 69 per cent supported or partially supported our proposals
- 28 per cent did not support them
- 4 per cent said they were not sure or did not give an opinion

Key issues raised by people responding to the consultation included:

- Support for proposals that would improve safety for cyclists
- Support for improved cycle facilities elsewhere
- Support for the proposed segregated cycle facilities
- Concern at cycling conditions on the elevated section of the A40 Westway
- A need for more access points for cyclists on the A40 elevated section
- Opposition to removing a traffic lane on A40 to create space for cycle track, as it would only increase congestion on this important route
- Fears that the proposals would cause an increase in air pollution

Our detailed analysis of responses is included as Appendix A.

Responses from stakeholders

We received 36 responses from stakeholders comprising politicians, statutory bodies, employers, trade organisations, residents’ associations, developers, campaign groups, disability groups, sporting and leisure amenities, and more. We have summarised the issues raised by these stakeholders in Appendix E.

Conclusion and next steps

The consultation showed strong support for segregated cycle facilities in west London that connect existing cycle routes and open up new areas to cyclists and pedestrians.

However, it also highlighted concerns about the suitability of the elevated section of the A40 Westway as a cycle route citing:

- Difficulties accessing and exiting the elevated route
- Potentially unpleasant cycling conditions (noise, spray, air pollution)
- The cost of adapting the structure

We are also due to carry out essential structural maintenance work on the A40 Westway carriageway in 2018-2020, as part of our programme of road improvements.
Alternative cycle superhighway route for west London
Following consideration of these issues (and the maintenance work in 2018-2020) we have decided not to go ahead with the proposed alignment from Lancaster Gate to Wood Lane via the A40 Westway. Instead we are assessing the feasibility of an alternative route along Bayswater Road, Notting Hill Gate, Holland Park Avenue and Wood Lane, ensuring shop frontage requirements and local accesses are taken into account. This alignment was identified as a key corridor by our Strategic Cycling Analysis (published June 2017).

We will continue to work closely with the local boroughs and engage with key stakeholders to discuss requirements.

Cycle Superhighway from Wood Lane to Acton
Between 8 February 2016 and 20 March 2016, we also consulted on proposals to improve existing cycling facilities between Wood Lane and Acton.

We intend to proceed with the overall scheme along the route consulted on - with some changes to the detailed proposals. We will finalise our designs and publish our response later this year.

We are also developing a new design for the Wood Lane junction, as a result of the decision not to use the elevated A40 Westway as part of the route. We will provide an update on our plans for the junction later this year.
1. About the proposals

1.1 Introduction
We proposed a continuous, segregated cycle route from Paddington to Wood Lane as part of the East-West Cycle Superhighway which runs from Tower Hill through central London. It would provide a clearer and safer route for cyclists through west London, separated from other vehicles.

1.2 Purpose
Our proposals would deliver improvements to cycling by providing a continuous, segregated cycle track for much of route. This would:

- improve safety
- reduce conflict between motor vehicles and cyclists
- encourage people who would like to cycle, but currently feel unable to do so.

Data from existing Cycle Superhighways suggest the new route would also draw cyclists away from other routes in west London which are less suitable for them.
1.3 Summary of the proposed improvements
The new section of route would join the current planned route at the junction of Westbourne Terrace by Craven Road and continue on to Westbourne Bridge.

The route would join the A40 Westway via the Harrow Road slip to Westbourne Terrace. It would then continue west along the elevated section of the route, replacing an eastbound traffic lane.

The segregated cycle track would join the shared-use footway at the junction of Wood Lane and the Westway.

Westbourne Terrace and Westbourne Bridge
- New segregated cycle tracks in both directions, connecting to the section of the East-West Cycle Superhighway previously consulted on
- Improvements to cyclist safety at the junctions with Craven Road, Chilworth Street, Cleveland Terrace, Bishop’s Bridge Road and Orsett Terrace
- Previously banned turning movements would now be permitted for cyclists at the junction of Westbourne Terrace with Bishop’s Bridge Road
- Segregated two-way cycle track across the eastern side of Westbourne Bridge, continuing onto the Westway via the Harrow Road slip
- New cycle connection between Westbourne Bridge and A404 Harrow Road

A40 Westway and Wood Lane
- Segregated two-way cycle track, separated from traffic by a 1 metre high vehicle restraint barrier on the north side of the elevated Westway.
- We are investigating an additional screen to protect cyclists from vehicle spray and cross winds, raising barrier height in total to 1.8 metres.
- Existing parapet on outside of the Westway to be raised to 1.4 metres.
- Segregated two-way cycle track continues across the north side of the elevated roundabout, continuing off the Westway via the Wood Lane slip.

Wood Lane
- New segregated cycle tracks in both directions through the Wood Lane junction beneath the Westway.
- Dedicated two-way cycle crossing from the south-eastern corner to the south-western corner of the junction.

Changes to road design and layout
- Banned right turn from Bishop's Bridge Road westbound into Westbourne Terrace northbound for all traffic except cyclists.
- Right turn from Bishop's Bridge Road westbound into Gloucester Terrace northbound reintroduced.

Changes to pedestrian facilities and crossings
- Conversion of pedestrian crossing of Bishop's Bridge Road at Westbourne Terrace from 'staggered' to straight across – no waiting at a central island.
- Relocation of ‘straight-across’ signalised pedestrian crossing from the northern arm of Wood Lane 19 m south to underneath the elevated Westway, to improve junction operation and reduce traffic delays.
- Removal of existing signalised pedestrian crossing on the southern arm of Wood Lane to improve junction operation and reduce traffic delays.

Changes to parking and loading
Some existing kerbside parking and loading would need to be relocated or removed to make space for the cycle track.
- Double yellow lines with no loading permitted would replace existing single yellow lines on Westbourne Terrace.
- Double yellow lines with off peak loading are also proposed on a section of Bishop's Bridge Road.
- Some parking spaces would be lost on Cleveland Terrace and Westbourne Terrace Road.

Changes to deliveries and servicing
We continue to work with businesses and freight operators to minimise the impact of these proposals on their operations.

If your home or workplace is on or near the proposed route, please let us know if the proposals could affect your deliveries, collections and servicing. We would
encourage you to discuss the proposals with companies undertaking these operations.
2. About the consultation

2.1 Purpose
The objectives of the consultation were to:

- give stakeholders and the public easily understandable information about the proposals and allow them to respond
- understand the level of support or opposition for the change/s in the proposals
- understand any issues that might affect the proposal of which we were not previously aware
- understand concerns and objections
- allow respondents to make suggestions

2.2 Potential outcomes
The potential outcomes of the consultation were:

- we decide the consultation raises no issues that should prevent us from proceeding with the scheme as originally planned
- we modify the scheme in response to issues raised in consultation and proceed
- we abandon the scheme as a result of issues raised in the consultation

Our conclusion and next steps are set out in Chapter 5.

2.3 Consultation history
We have conducted a number of consultations on the wider East-West Cycle Superhighway. We first consulted on overall proposals for the East-West Cycle Superhighway in September 2014.

Between 9 February and 29 March 2015, we consulted on further proposals for the following sections: Hyde Park, St James Park, Green Park, Victoria Embankment/ Northumberland Avenue and Lancaster Gate.

We referred to the proposals for the Paddington to Acton section in those consultations and stated our intention to consult. Further information about these consultations can be found here.

2.4 Who we consulted
We consulted the public, businesses and stakeholders about our proposals.

To raise awareness among motorists, cyclists, bus users and other public transport users we targeted individuals who we knew used the route or lived in areas nearby (identified from our customer database because they had supplied their postcode to us via Oyster, Congestion Charging, Cycle Hire, or for another reason)
We sent emails to stakeholders likely to be interested in the scheme, including disability groups, organisations representing the elderly, transport user groups, businesses and major employers, trade organisations, statutory organisations, charities, local government, politicians, residents’ associations, healthcare providers, sports clubs and educational establishments, amongst others.

We also provided information about the proposals and the consultation to local and regional media.

For a full list of the publicity channels used, please go to Section 2.8 below.

2.5 Dates and duration
The consultation ran for six weeks from 8 February to 20 March 2016. It was timed to take place before the pre-election period that preceded the London Mayoral election in May 2016.

2.6 What we asked
The area covered by the proposals was large, so we divided the route into six sections to make it easier for people to digest the information and give feedback on areas of interest to them. Respondents could also provide comments on the scheme as a whole.

The survey questionnaire comprised several closed questions asking people to select an answer that matched their level of support (or opposition) for the scheme and each of its route sections. We also gave people the chance to provide comments on the overall scheme and each section.

The only mandatory question we asked was on the respondent’s level of support for the proposals (‘support’, ‘partially support’, ‘don’t support’, ‘not sure’, ‘no opinion’). They were also invited to comment on the proposals via a free text responses.

Respondents were also asked to submit their name, email address and postcode, along with information about their cycling and other travel habits.

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.

A full list of questions asked as part of the consultation is available in Chapters 3 and 4.
2.7 Methods of responding

People were able to respond to the consultation by:

- answering the questions in the survey on our consultation website at consultations.tfl.gov.uk/cycling/0e1209f5
- sending a letter to FREEPOST TfL CONSULTATIONS
- emailing: consultations@tfl.gov.uk. The Consultation Team also answered questions from members of the public and stakeholders via email
- phoning our Customer Service Team. The team had been briefed on the scheme and could answer questions and take responses from members of the public. Any questions they were unable to answer immediately, were forwarded to the Consultation Team for response.
- leaving comments and/or filling in questionnaires at one of the public drop-in sessions (or posting a questionnaire to the address above)

Foreign language translations, large print, Braille or audio versions of our consultation materials could be requested from our Customer Services Team.

2.8 Consultation materials and publicity

We used a range of channels to raise awareness of the consultation and ensure that members of the public and stakeholders were aware of its purposes. All materials encouraged interested parties to visit our website or contact us to find out more about the scheme and how to respond.

2.8.1 Website

The website provided detailed information about the consultation, including text explanations of the proposals, maps and computer-generated images helping to explain the proposals. It was divided into pages:

- showing an overview of the scheme,
- explaining the separate sections of the route,
- containing in-depth information about motor traffic impacts, pedestrian impacts and bus impacts.

The website provided people with the opportunity to respond to the consultation by answering our questionnaire.

2.8.2 Letters

A letter and map was sent to over 15,600 addresses in the Lancaster Gate and Paddington area on Tuesday 9 February 2016. A second letter was sent on Monday 22 February, highlighting proposed changes to permitted turning movements at the junctions of Bishop’s Bridge Road with Westbourne Terrace and Gloucester Terrace. Copies of the letters and a map of the distribution area can be found in Appendix C.
2.8.3 Emails to public
We sent an email about the consultation to 11,300 people who live locally or use our transport services in the area. The data for the distribution list is extracted from our master database of those who have registered their details with us – for example, through use of Congestion Charge, Oyster Card or Cycle Hire services. The text of the email is reproduced in Appendix D.

2.8.4 Public meetings, events and exhibitions

Public drop-in events
During the consultation period we held 10 public drop-in events at times and locations designed to capture a broad audience of attendees. At each event TfL staff were available to answer questions about the scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date and time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Acton Pavilion, North Acton Playing Fields, Noel Road, Acton, W3 0JF</td>
<td>Saturday 20 February 1000-1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Snug, Paddington Central, 1a Sheldon Square, Paddington, London W2 6PY</td>
<td>Tuesday 23 February 0700-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Acton Pavilion, North Acton Playing Fields, Noel Road, Acton, W3 0JF</td>
<td>Thursday 25 February 1600-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White City Community Centre, India Way, White City, W12 7QT</td>
<td>Friday 26 February 1600-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Snug, Paddington Central, 1a Sheldon Square, Paddington, London W2 6PY</td>
<td>Saturday 27 February 1100-1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Snug, Paddington Central, 1a Sheldon Square, Paddington, London W2 6PY</td>
<td>Wednesday 02 March 1600-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White City Community Centre, India Way, White City, W12 7QT</td>
<td>Friday 04 March 1600-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Dunstan's East Acton, Friars Place Lane, London W3 7AW</td>
<td>Tuesday 08 March 1300-1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Snug, Paddington Central, 1a Sheldon Square, Paddington, London W2 6PY</td>
<td>Wednesday 09 March 1600-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Dunstan's East Acton, Friars Place Lane, London W3 7AW</td>
<td>Saturday 12 March 1230-1630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We visited businesses on Westbourne Terrace to hand-deliver a questionnaire requesting details of their freight and servicing requirements.
2.8.5 **Meetings with stakeholders**
We met with a number of stakeholders to discuss the plans, update them on the scheme and discuss other aspects of the proposals. These meetings took place before and during the consultation. The stakeholders we met included:

**Political**
- Westminster City Council
- Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
- London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham

**Transport**
- Paddington Residents Actively Concerned with Transport (PRACT)
- DRG
- Freight Transport Association
- Road Haulage Association
- John Lewis Partnership
- Sainsbury’s
- British Beer and Pub Association.
- Central London LSP (London Service Permit) and Express Operators
- Crossrail
- Network Rail
- Licensed Taxi Drivers Association

**Local and residential**
- South East Bayswater Residents Association (SEBRA)
- Westway Trust

**Cultural and heritage**
- Paddington and Maida Vale Waterways Society (PMVWS)
- Westfield Europe Limited
- Imperial College

**Businesses**
- St James
- Stanhope
- BBC

In the Paddington area we engaged with the local interest groups Paddington Residents Active Concern on Transport (PRACT) and South East Bayswater Residents’ Association (SEBRA).
We worked closely with the City of Westminster, the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham. We met with officers and councillors to help finalise designs for the scheme and details of the consultation.

2.9 Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA)
We took steps to ensure that all groups in the community, such as elderly, disabled or faith organisations were made aware of the proposals, their potential impacts and how to respond to the consultation. Measures taken included:

- Identifying and emailing relevant stakeholders such as British Dyslexia Association, Age UK London, Guide Dogs, Royal National Institute for the Blind, Action on Hearing Loss and Inclusion London, inviting them to respond to the consultation
- Ensuring that the materials were written in plain English, and available on request in different formats (for example, Braille, large print, other languages)
- Making sure that public events were held in accessible locations and at different times of the day and that large scale materials were available to review
- Considering how best to reach our target audiences and tailoring the way of communicating with them. For example, by preparing hard copies of our online material for those not able to access our website

We are fully aware of our obligations under the Equality Act 2010, in particular the effect of the public sector equality duty on our decision-making.

2.10 Analysis of consultation responses
We commissioned JMP Consultants to analyse the consultation responses. All closed questions were reviewed and the results tabulated and reported.

All open questions, where respondents provided comments on the overall scheme or parts of it, were read and analysed in detail. Each individual comment was attributed with one or more codes according to the issues raised. This information was also analysed and tabulated, and JMP’s tagging checked and verified by the TfL Consultation Team. All results are reported in Chapter 3, Chapter 4 and Appendix A of this report.

Where more than one response had been submitted from the same person and IP address, these responses were combined before the data was analysed. Throughout this process we were mindful of our responsibilities under the Data Protection Act.
3. About the respondents

This chapter provides more information on respondents to this consultation, based on the information they provided to us in our questionnaire.

3.1 Number of respondents
847 respondents replied to the consultation. Of these, 753 were via the online consultation portal and 94 were written submissions. Of the 847 responses, 818 were from individual members of the public and 29 were from stakeholders. (Stakeholder responses are those submitted by individuals who identify themselves as representing political entities, organisations, businesses or campaign groups).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public responses</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder responses</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 How respondents heard about the consultation
We asked respondents how they heard about the consultation. A total of 511 respondents answered this question. Percentages are given as a proportion of the total number of respondents to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heard about the consultation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received an email from TfL</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read about it in the press</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received a letter from TfL</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet from a TfL representative</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TfL website</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London/Ealing Cycling Campaign</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other website</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/friend/word of mouth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public exhibition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television/radio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Respondent postcodes
Of the 847 respondents a total of 504 respondents supplied a postcode. Five areas accounted for 38% of all postcodes provided, as shown below. Percentages are given as a proportion of the total number of respondents to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postcode</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


![Map showing respondent postcodes]
3.4 Relationship between respondent and scheme area
We asked respondents to describe their relationship to the scheme area using the categories below, with respondents encouraged to tick one or more categories. 533 respondents answered this question, with a total of 781 responses recorded.

Percentages are given as a proportion of the total number of respondents to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local resident</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter to the area</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor to the area</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed locally</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not local but interested in the scheme</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business owner</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

294 respondents (55%) stated that they were a ‘local resident’ followed by ‘commuter to the area’ with 150 respondents (28%), ‘visitor to the area’ with 111 respondents (21%) and ‘employed locally’ with 89 respondents (17%).

66 respondents (12%) stated that they were ‘not local, but interested in the scheme,’ 35 respondents (7%) were classified as ‘business owners and 36 respondents (7%) stated ‘other.’
3.5 Modes of transport

We asked respondents to tell us what modes of transport they usually use to travel locally and to tick all options that apply. 534 respondents answered this question, with a total of 2,043 modes recorded. Percentages are given as a proportion of the total number of respondents to this question.

The most popular mode of transport was bicycle with 380 respondents (71%) followed by the Tube with 374 respondents (70%) and walking with 360 respondents (67%).

276 respondents (52%) said they use the bus, 250 respondents (47%) said they use a private car, 179 respondents (34%) said they use a train and 149 respondents (28) stated they use a taxi.

Motorcycle, coach, and van accounted for 59 respondents (11%) and 16 respondents (3%) stated other.
3.6 Cycle usage
Respondents were asked to say how often they use a bicycle, and a total of 523 respondents answered the question. Percentages are given as a proportion of the total number of respondents to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of cycle use</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most days</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a week</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less often</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About 1-3 times a month</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>523</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

263 respondents (50%) stated that they cycle ‘most days’ whilst 76 respondents (14%) stated they ‘never cycle.’ 89 respondents (17%) stated they cycle ‘about once a week,’ 57 respondents (10%) stated they cycle ‘less often’ and 38 respondents (7%) stated they cycle ‘1-3 times a month.’

3.7 Types of cycling
We asked respondents who cycle to specify the types of cycling they engage in, and to tick all options that apply. 523 respondents answered this question. Percentages are given as a proportion of the total number of respondents to this question.
327 respondents (75%) cycle for ‘leisure’ followed by ‘commuting’ with 295 respondents (67%). 91 respondents (21%) cycle to ‘work,’ 79 respondents (18%) cycle to ‘train’ and 41 respondents (9%) stated ‘other.’ ‘Other’ categories included using a bicycle for local errands and for short-distance travel.

### 3.8 Quality of the consultation

We invited all respondents to comment on the quality of the consultation, and the style and content of the information provided. 239 respondents provided comments on the consultation.

Positive comments included:
- The consultation material was of good quality, in particular the maps
- Many respondents felt information provided was clear and easy to understand

Negative comments included:
- Consultation responses would not be taken into account due to bias
- The consultation website was difficult to use
4. Summary of all consultation responses

4.1 About this chapter
To gain feedback on the scheme, we asked respondents nine closed questions, allowing them to show their level of support for the overall scheme and for each of the eight sections. We also asked nine open questions which allowed respondents to comment on the overall scheme and each of the eight sections.

Note that stakeholder responses are included in all the results in this chapter, and percentages are calculated from the number of respondents for each question. Only the question asking for the level of support for the overall scheme was mandatory for online respondents. Detailed analysis of all questions can be found in Appendix A.

4.2 Support for overall proposals and sections 1 to 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Partial support</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 7</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 8</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Q1: Do you support the overall proposals for the East-West Cycle Superhighway from Paddington to Wood Lane?

847 respondents answered this question by expressing their level of support for the overall proposals. Options to answer were: Yes, Partially, Not sure, No opinion, No.

If respondents did not provide an answer to this question (because they submitted an email or letter rather than using our online questionnaire) and there was an obvious support or otherwise for the scheme, then our analysts inferred a response based on the comments provided.
Q2: Do you have any comments on our overall proposals for the East-West Cycle Superhighway from Paddington to Wood Lane?

632 respondents answered this question asking for comments on the overall proposals. The table below shows the most frequently raised issues in responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would improve safety for cyclists</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More access points for cyclists needed along the elevated section</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of a traffic lane will increase congestion</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The A40 Westway is already congested</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported the proposed segregated cycle facilities</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed removal of a traffic lane to create space for cycle track</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals will cause an increase in air pollution</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported improved cycle facilities elsewhere</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed concern at cycling conditions on the elevated structure</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5 Q3: Do you support our proposals for Westbourne Terrace?

514 respondents answered this question giving their level of support for Westbourne Terrace. Options to answer were: Yes, Partially, No, Not sure, No opinion.

![Chart showing support levels]

4.6 Q4: Do you have any comments about our proposals for Westbourne Terrace?

197 respondents answered this question asking for comments on the Westbourne Terrace proposals. The table below shows the most frequently raised issues in responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressed concern that the scheme would increase congestion</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals would improve safety for cyclists</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support segregated cycle facilities</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals would be more dangerous for cyclists</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed concern at the risk of left hook collisions</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed removing traffic lane</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals will cause an increase in air pollution</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current situation is dangerous for cyclists</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commented on pedestrian crossings on Westbourne Terrace</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7  Q5: Do you support our proposals for the Bishop’s Bridge Road/Orsett Terrace junction?

470 respondents answered this question giving their level of support for the Bishop’s Bridge Road/Orsett Terrace junction? Options to answer were: Yes, Partially, No, Not sure, No opinion.

![Bar chart showing support levels]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Partial support</th>
<th>Did not support</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>304 Respondents</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8  Q6: Do you have any comments about our proposals for the Bishop’s Bridge Road/Orsett Terrace junction?

174 respondents answered this question asking for comments on the Bishop’s Bridge Road/Orsett Terrace junction. The table below shows the most frequently raised issues in responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The scheme would increase traffic congestion on Westbourne Terrace</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The designs risked creating conflict between cyclists and general traffic</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support segregated cycle facilities</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of left hook collisions at the Bishop’s Bridge Road junctions</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested improvements to the proposed cycle facilities</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals did not take account of other road users</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate cycle signal phases should be introduced instead of advanced stop lines at the Bishop’s Bridge Road/Westbourne Terrace junction</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals provide too much for cyclists, disproportionate to the need</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer journey times through the area for general traffic</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would cause an increase in air pollution</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.9  Q7: Do you support our proposals for the Bishop’s Bridge Road/Gloucester Terrace junction?

455 respondents answered this question giving their level of support for the Bishop's Bridge Road/Gloucester Terrace junction? Options to answer were: Yes, Partially, No, Not sure, No opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial support</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not support</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.10  Q8: Do you have any comments about our proposals for the Bishop’s Bridge Road/Gloucester Terrace junction?

138 respondents answered this question asking for comments on the Bishop’s Bridge Road/Gloucester Terrace junction. The table below shows the most frequently raised issues in responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressed concern at a potential increase in traffic congestion</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More substantial cycle facilities should be provided at this junction, such as segregation and separate signal phases</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Stop Lines insufficient to address risk of cyclist/vehicle conflict</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would cause an increase in air pollution</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals would be more dangerous for cyclists</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals provide too much for cyclists, disproportionate to the need</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would improve safety for cyclists</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objected to the proposals due to cost</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to permitted turning movements on Bishop’s Bridge Road will increase congestion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer journey times through the area for general traffic</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.11  Q9: Do you support our proposals for Westbourne Bridge to Harrow Road Slip?

447 respondents answered this question giving their level of support for the Westbourne Bridge to Harrow Road Slip proposals. Options to answer were: Yes, Partially, No, Not sure, No opinion.

![Bar graph showing responses to Q9](chart.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Partial support</th>
<th>Did not support</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.12  Q10: Do you have any comments about our proposals for Westbourne Bridge to Harrow Road Slip?

159 respondents answered this question asking for comments on the proposals for Westbourne Bridge to Harrow Road Slip. The table below shows the most frequently raised issues in responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would lead to increased traffic congestion</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General comments in support of segregated facilities</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on the design of the 1.8m segregating barrier</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals would improve safety for cyclists</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would lead to an increase in air pollution</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The two-way cycle track should be wider</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objected to the proposals due to cost, and the money would be better spent elsewhere,</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve facilities for cyclists accessing the East-West route at the junction</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed the scheme due to poor cyclist behaviour</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer journey times through the area for general traffic</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.13 Q11: Do you support our proposals for Harrow Road slip to Westway?

453 respondents answered this question giving their level of support for the Harrow Road slip to Westway proposals. Options to answer were: Yes, Partially, No, Not sure, No opinion.

![Support, Partial support, Did not support, Not sure, No opinion bar chart]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would lead to increased traffic congestion</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on the design of the 1.8m segregating barrier</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The two-way cycle track should be wider</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed removal of a traffic lane to create space for cycle track</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would lead to an increase in air pollution</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General comments in support of proposed segregated facilities</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals would improve safety for cyclists</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More access points for cyclists needed along the elevated section 8
Longer journey times through the area for general traffic 7
Opposed the scheme due to poor cyclist behaviour 6

4.15 Q13: Do you support our proposals for the Westway (Harrow Road slip to West Cross Roundabout)?
465 respondents answered this question giving their level of support for the Westway (Harrow Road slip to West Cross Roundabout) proposals. Options to answer were: Yes, Partially, No, Not sure, No opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Partial support</th>
<th>Did not support</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 66%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.16 Q14: Do you have any comments about our proposals for the Westway (Harrow Road slip to West Cross Roundabout)?
182 respondents answered this question asking for comments on the proposals for Westway (Harrow Road slip to West Cross Roundabout). The table below shows the most frequently raised issues in responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would lead to increased traffic congestion</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed removal of a traffic lane to create space for cycle track</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on the design of the 1.8m segregating barrier</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General negative comments opposing cycle track on the elevated Westway</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More access points for cyclists needed along the elevated section 20
Opposed the reallocation of roadspace from general traffic to cyclists 15
Expressed concern at the impact on a major route into central London 15
Longer journey times through the area for general traffic 11
The proposals provide too much for cyclists, disproportionate to the need 10
The proposals would lead to an increase in air pollution 9

4.17 Q15: Do you support our proposals for the Westway (West Cross Roundabout to Wood Lane Slip)?
442 respondents answered this question giving their level of support for the Westway (West Cross Roundabout to Wood Lane Slip) proposals. Options to answer were: Yes, Partially, No, Not sure, No opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would lead to increased traffic congestion</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed removal of a traffic lane to create space for cycle track</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.18 Q16: Do you have any comments about our proposals for the Westway (West Cross Roundabout to Wood Lane Slip)?
144 respondents answered this question asking for comments on the proposals for Westway (West Cross Roundabout to Wood Lane Slip). The table below shows the most frequently raised issues in responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would lead to increased traffic congestion</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed removal of a traffic lane to create space for cycle track</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.19  Q17: Do you support our proposals for Wood Lane junction?

460 respondents answered this question giving their level of support for the Westway (Harrow Road slip to West Cross Roundabout) proposals. Options to answer were: Yes, Partially, No, Not sure, No opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Partial support</th>
<th>Did not support</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.20  Q18: Do you have any comments about our proposals for Wood Lane junction?

171 respondents answered this question asking for comments on the proposals for the Wood Lane junction. The table below shows the most frequently raised issues in responses to this question.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would lead to increased traffic congestion</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle facilities should be extended to link to other local cycle routes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed concern at shared space and risk of pedestrian/cyclist conflict</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed the reallocation of roadspace from general traffic to cyclists</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals would improve safety for cyclists</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More segregation should be installed along the on-slip and traffic islands</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals represented too much provision for cyclists, disproportionate to the need</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer journey times through the area for general traffic</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative impact on Westfield, other local businesses, and Queen’s Park Rangers football club</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient existing demand for this alignment</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.21 Quality of the consultation

We invited all respondents to comment on the quality of the consultation, and the style and content of the information provided. 239 respondents provided comments on the consultation.

Positive comments included:

- The consultation material was of good quality, in particular the maps
- Many respondents felt that the information provided was clear and easy to understand

Negative comments included:

- Consultation responses would not be taken into account due to bias
- The consultation website was difficult to use

### 4.22 Summary of comments from events

We held six drop-in sessions during the spring 2016 consultation from Paddington to Acton (see Section 2.8.4). The main themes or issues to emerge from these events were:

- access to the Westway section
- the environmental impacts of the scheme
- comments about the current route
- suggestions for alternative routes for the Cycle Superhighway
4.23 Social media activity
We publicised the consultation online through the @TfL Twitter feed. @TfL has 1.42 million followers.

Our proposed extension of the East-West Cycle Superhighway would provide a segregated cycle track on the Westway
5. **Conclusion and next steps**

Between 8 February 2016 and 20 March 2016, we consulted on proposals to extend the East-West Cycle Superhighway from Paddington to Wood Lane. The proposals would provide a clearer and safer route for cyclists through west London, separated from other vehicles.

We received 847 responses to our consultation, of which 69 per cent supported or partially supported our proposals. 28 per cent did not support them, and 4 per cent said they were not sure or did not give an opinion.

Key issues raised by those responding to the consultation included:

- The proposals would improve safety for cyclists
- More access points for cyclists needed along the elevated section
- The removal of a traffic lane would increase congestion
- The A40 Westway is already congested
- Support for the proposed segregated cycle facilities
- Oppose the removal of a traffic lane to create space for cycle track
- The proposals would cause an increase in air pollution
- Support for improved cycle facilities elsewhere
- Concern at cycling conditions on the elevated structure

Our detailed analysis of responses is included as [Appendix A](#).

**Conclusion and next steps**

The consultation showed strong support for segregated cycle facilities in west London, which could connect existing cycle routes while opening up new areas to cyclists and pedestrians. However, the consultation also highlighted a number of concerns related to the suitability of the elevated Westway structure as a cycle route. These concerns included difficulties accessing and exiting the elevated route, the potential for unpleasant cycling conditions, and the cost of adapting the structure.

Furthermore, we will carry out [essential structural maintenance work](#) on the A40 Westway carriageway in 2018-2020, as part of our programme of road improvements.

**Alternative cycle superhighway route for west London**

Following consideration of these issues (and the maintenance work in 2018-2020) we have decided not to go ahead with the proposed alignment from Lancaster Gate to Wood Lane via the A40 Westway. Instead we are assessing the feasibility of an alternative route along Bayswater Road, Notting Hill Gate, Holland Park Avenue and Wood Lane, ensuring shop frontage requirements and local accesses are taken into account.
account. This alignment was identified as a key corridor by our Strategic Cycling Analysis (published June 2017).

We will continue to work closely with the local boroughs and engage with key stakeholders to discuss requirements.

**Cycle Superhighway from Wood Lane to Acton**
Between 8 February 2016 and 20 March 2016, we also consulted on proposals to improve existing cycling facilities between Wood Lane and Acton. We intend to proceed with the overall scheme along the route alignment consulted on, although with some changes to the detailed proposals. We will continue to finalise our designs and will publish our response later this year.

We are also developing a new design for the Wood Lane junction, accounting for our decision not to install cycle facilities on the elevated Westway. We will provide an update on our plans for the junction later this year.
Appendix A: Detailed analysis of comments

All respondents were invited to provide comments through our open questions, but none of these open questions were mandatory. In this appendix we summarise the issues that were raised in these comments.

For each question, we list the main analysis of themes in descending order of frequency. All percentages given below are calculated from all 847 consultation respondents, including stakeholders.

Q2: Do you have any comments about our overall proposals for the East-West Cycle Superhighway from Paddington to Wood Lane?

We invited all respondents to comment on the overall proposals. 652 respondents answered this question, and the issues raised are summarised below. Percentages are calculated from all 847 consultation respondents.

Impact on traffic / congestion
185 (21%) respondents commented on the potential impact of the proposals on traffic and congestion:

- 89 (10%) respondents opposed the removal of traffic lanes to create space for the cycle facilities
  - Of these, 50 (6%) stated that reallocation of road space would create congestion
- 51 (6%) respondents said that the roads directly affected by the proposals are already congested
- 34 (4%) respondents said that the proposals did not consider the other road users:
  - 24 (3%) said the proposals did not consider car drivers
  - 14 (2%) said the proposals did not consider bus passengers
  - 4 (<1%) said the proposals did not consider black cabs and minicabs
  - 2 (<1%) said the proposals did not consider coach passengers
- 33 (4%) respondents stated the proposals would increase traffic congestion in the surrounding area
- 30 (4%) respondents said air pollution would worsen as congestion increases due to the proposals
- 22 (3%) respondents said air quality would improve as more people would cycle as a result of the scheme
- 14 (2%) respondents said journey times for road users would increase due to the proposals. Reasons included
  - the proposed reallocation of road space
  - separate signal phases for cyclists
  - the banned turn from Bishop’s Bridge Road into Westbourne Terrace
Six (1%) respondents supported the proposals as they would reduce the amount of traffic on the A40 Westway

Five (1%) respondents called for more data to be provided on potential traffic impacts, including strategic modelling and traffic reassignment

Four (<1%) respondents suggested that the cycle track could be built either alongside the elevated Westway, or suspended underneath it. This would significantly reduce its impact on traffic and congestion

Four (<1%) respondents supported the reallocation of roadspace from general traffic to cyclists

Two (<1%) respondents said that the proposals would increase noise pollution due to the impact on traffic and congestion

Routing, alignment and access
146 (17%) respondents commented on the routing and alignment of the proposals from Paddington to Wood Lane:

56 (6%) respondents commented on the absence of access points for cyclists wishing to join the East-West route between Westbourne Bridge and Wood Lane. Some stated that this would minimise the appeal and usage of a cycle track on the elevated Westway should it be built. Others asked whether it would be possible to build lifts or ramps at mid-points
  o 10 (1%) stated that an access point should be built at Ladbroke Grove
  o Six (1%) requested access to the Westway from Westbourne Park
  o Five (1%) highlighted existing and future demand for access to Portobello Road Market as a reason to build a lift or ramp there
  o Other respondents commented that mid-point ramps or lifts would cater for cyclists from a much wider area, such as Kensal Green and Queen’s Park to the north, and Notting Hill and Kensington to the south

26 (3%) respondents stated we should provide cycle facilities along the Westway alignment at street level, either as an alternative to or instead of the cycle track on the elevated structure:
  o 15 (2%) commented that street-level facilities would cater for shorter journeys and provide easier connections to the surrounding area and other sections of the cycle network
  o 10 (1%) stated the East-West alignment should be on quieter roads to minimise the impact on traffic. This would also provide safety and health benefits for cyclists

25 (3%) respondents said we should additionally improve cycling provision in the area surrounding the proposed alignment

23 (3%) respondents commented that cyclists would continue to use other routes, such as the Grand Union Canal or A402 Bayswater Road/Holland Park Avenue, as they offered more convenient access to a wider area and at ground level. The East-West scheme should be realigned along one of these routings to reflect this
• 22 (3%) respondents made general comments in support of the segregated cycle track on the elevated Westway

• 14 (2%) respondents suggested alternative alignments for the route
  - Nine (1%) suggested that the cycle track should continue from Lancaster Gate along Bayswater Road and Uxbridge Road
  - Four (<1%) commented that we should make use of the Grand Union Canal, either along the towpath or by constructing a floating boardwalk
  - One (<1%) said we should cater for demand in Kensington and Chelsea and construct the cycle track along Cromwell Road

• 13 respondents (2%) commented that the proposals represented too much provision for cyclists, disproportionate to the need
  - Nine (1%) said there is no evidence of demand for facilities on the elevated structure, and therefore the cycle facilities should not be built
  - Five (1%) commented that existing cycle infrastructure in the scheme area is little used by cyclists

• Nine (1%) respondents commented that the cycle track on the elevated structure would be little used should it be built
  - Cycling conditions would be unattractive due to the route being adjacent to a five-lane motorway, cyclists would be intimidated by traffic and affected by noise and air pollution
  - Cyclists would find the two-mile track repetitive and uninteresting, and would seek other routes that are more direct

• Eight (1%) respondents expressed concern about the Westway alignment due to the gradient of the off-slip at Westbourne Bridge and the on-slip at Wood Lane. The steep ascents and descents could discourage many potential users from using the cycle track

• Seven (1%) respondents commented on the benefits the Westway cycle facility would provide. The proposals would provide a quick and safe route for cyclists between Paddington and Wood Lane, encourage more people to take up cycling and reduce pressure on the public transport and road networks

• Three (<1%) respondents said the proposals were justified. Bayswater Road and Uxbridge Road are too congested to construct safe cycle facilities, and the Grand Union Canal already experiences heavy cycle flows at peak times

**Cyclist safety / health**

135 (16%) respondents commented on the proposed cycle facilities:

• 68 (8%) respondents made general comments that the proposals would improve safety for cyclists

• 25 (3%) respondents questioned how dangerous the conditions cyclists would face on the elevated Westway, particularly in high winds or rain

• 19 (2%) respondents expressed concern that cyclists would be exposed to higher levels of vehicle exhaust emissions while cycling on the elevated Westway
• 12 (1%) respondents stated the proposals would have a positive impact on cyclist health, due to vehicle emissions decreasing as more people take up cycling
• Seven (1%) respondents made general comments that the proposals would make cycling conditions more dangerous for cyclists
• Three (<1%) respondents expressed concern about the risk of antisocial behaviour on the track, and suggested security measures such as CCTV would be required

Cycle facilities
105 (12%) respondents commented on the proposed cycle facilities:
• 46 (5%) respondents supported the provision of segregated cycle tracks, as it would encourage more people to travel by bicycle and create a safer environment for cyclists
• 22 (3%) respondents called for the segregated cycle track to be wider, in particular on the Wood Lane and Harrow road slips
• 18 (2%) respondents commented on the design of the proposed barrier on the elevated Westway. They said it should be high enough to prevent spray and vehicle noise from affecting cyclists, and provide protection from vehicles striking the barrier:
  o Five (1%) requested a green wall be built as part of the barrier
  o Three (<1%) stated that high-quality lighting on the elevated cycle track would be necessary to ensure cyclists could travel safely
• Six (1%) respondents opposed the introduction of segregated cycling facilities as unnecessary
• Four (<1%) respondents called for more segregation at junctions along Westbourne Terrace, physically separating cyclists from other traffic
  o Three expressed concern at the risk of left-hook collisions
• Three respondents (<1%) requested that traffic signals be phased to provide more green time for cyclists. One requested more cycle-only traffic signals be installed along the route
• One respondent (<1%) said single-direction, with-flow cycle lanes and tracks should be installed, to avoid confusing other road users and improve safety

Cost
29 (3%) respondents commented on issues related to the cost of the scheme:
• 16 (2%) respondents described the proposals as a waste of money. They felt that few cyclists would not use cycle track, and that the negative impact on general traffic would outweigh any benefits of the scheme
• Eight (1%) respondents made general comments expressing concern at the potential cost of the proposals
• 7 (1%) respondents stated that the money should rather be spent elsewhere, for the benefit of other road users
Cyclist behaviour and ‘road tax’
22 (3%) respondents commented on how they perceived cyclist behaviour:
- 17 (2%) respondents said cyclists do not obey the Highway Code, exhibiting behaviour such as including jumping red lights and ignoring pedestrian crossings, and caused danger to pedestrians
- Five respondents (1%) stated that cyclists do not pay ‘road tax’ or insurance, and therefore cycle facilities should not be installed or improved as cyclists had not paid for them
- Two (<1%) respondents stated that closed-circuit television cameras should be installed to ensure cyclist compliance with stop lines, traffic signals and the Highway Code

Impact on local residents, businesses and emergency services
13 (2%) respondents commented on the potential impact of the proposals on local residents, businesses and emergency services:
- Four (<1%) respondents expressed concern that the scheme would have a negative impact on businesses in the scheme area. This would result both from disruption during construction, and the negative impact on traffic in the area
- Four (<1%) respondents expressed concern that the scheme would have a specific, negative impact on Westfield and the people who shop and work there
- Four (<1%) respondents said local deliveries to homes and businesses would be disrupted
- Three (<1%) respondents expressed concern that emergency services would experience greater difficulty responding to callouts both during and after construction of the cycle facilities

Q4: ‘Do you have any comments about our proposals for Westbourne Terrace?’
197 (23%) respondents provided comments, and the issues raised are summarised below. Percentages are calculated from all 847 consultation respondents.

Impact on traffic / congestion
59 (7%) respondents commented on the potential impact of the Westbourne Terrace proposals on traffic and congestion:
- 44 (5%) respondents said the proposals would increase traffic congestion:
  - o 12 (1%) opposed the reallocation of road space for cycle facilities as it would cause more congestion
  - o Respondents also cited the proposed signalised pedestrian crossings at the junction with Cleveland Terrace
• Ten (1%) respondents said the proposals would increase air pollution along Westbourne Terrace as a result of the traffic congestion
  o Two (<1%) said noise pollution would also increase as a result
• Two (<1%) respondents said the proposals would improve air quality, as they would encourage people to cycle rather than drive

**Cycle safety**
41 (5%) respondents commented on issues related to cycle safety:
• 24 (3%) respondents said the proposals would improve safety for cyclists
• 15 (2%) respondents expressed concern that the proposals would make Westbourne Terrace more dangerous for cyclists
  o 13 (2%) cited the potential for conflict between cyclists and left-turning vehicles at the junctions of Craven Road, Chilworth Street and Cleveland Terrace
  o Two (<1%) said that the narrower junction layouts would be harder to manoeuvre for all road users
• Nine (1%) respondents said that the current situation on Westbourne Terrace is dangerous for cyclists, with cyclists sharing road space with other traffic

**Cycle facilities**
33 (4%) respondents commented on issues related to cycle facilities:
• 23 (3%) respondents supported the introduction of segregated cycle tracks
• Five (1%) respondents called for more segregation to be introduced at the junctions with Craven Road, Chilworth Street and Cleveland Terrace
• One respondent (<1%) called for more advanced stop lines to be introduced, while another respondent suggested that compliance with the advanced stop lines be enforced by closed-circuit cameras

**Routing and alignment**
• Seven (1%) respondents commented on the routing and alignment of the route at Westbourne Terrace:
  o Four (<1%) respondents requested that cycle facilities be extended to link up with Paddington station to the east, Little Venice to the north, and Bayswater to the west
  o Three (<1%) respondents said that traffic volumes on Westbourne Terrace are too high for cycle facilities to be installed, and alignment should be along quieter roads

**Impact on local residents and businesses**
Five (<1%) respondents commented on the potential impact of the proposals on local residents and businesses:
• Three (<1%) respondents expressed concern that parking would be removed to create space for the cycle tracks and new junction layouts
• One respondent (<1%) said that the segregated cycle tracks would prevent taxis from picking up or setting down mobility-impaired passengers and wheelchair users
• One respondent (<1%) said the introduction of double yellow lines and stopping/loading restrictions on Westbourne Terrace would adversely affect coaches picking up and dropping off passengers at hotels

Q6: ‘Do you have any comments about our proposals for the Bishop’s Bridge Road-Orsett Terrace junction?’

174 (21%) respondents provided comments, and the issues raised are summarised below. Percentages are calculated from all 847 consultation respondents.

Impact on traffic / congestion
43 (5%) respondents commented on the potential impact of the Bishop’s Bridge Road-Orsett Terrace junction proposals on traffic and congestion:
• 33 (4%) respondents said the proposals would increase traffic congestion
• 12 respondents said the proposals did not take account of other road users, (cars, coaches, taxis, buses and emergency vehicles)
• Ten respondents said the proposals disproportionately benefited cyclists, and did not do enough for other road users
• Nine respondents commented the proposals would increase journey times for traffic travelling through the area
• Nine respondents said delays to journey times and increased congestion would cause an increase in air pollution
  o One said the proposals would reduce air pollution, as they would encourage drivers to take up cycling
• Three respondents opposed the proposed ban on the right turn from Bishop’s Bridge Road westbound into Westbourne Terrace. They said it would increase congestion and delays in surrounding roads as traffic on Bishop’s Bridge Road would have to use Eastbourne Terrace and Cleveland Terrace to access Westbourne Terrace northbound
  o One respondent said he would be unable to access his garage on Westbourne Terrace from Bishop’s Bridge Road due to congestion
• Three respondents said the negative impact of the proposals on traffic would have a knock-on impact on pedestrians. Traffic would use other roads in the surrounding area, making it more difficult for pedestrians to cross
• One respondent said that the delays to journey times and increased congestion would cause an increase in noise pollution
Cycle safety
40 (5%) respondents commented on issues related to cycle safety:
- 17 respondents stated that the designs risked creating conflict between cyclists and general traffic
  - 15 highlighted the left-hook risk at the junction of Bishop’s Bridge Road and Westbourne Terrace
- Seven respondents said the proposals would improve safety for cyclists
- Seven respondents stated that the proposals would be more dangerous for cyclists than the current road layout
- Five respondents said they do not feel the current road layout is safe

Cycle facilities
35 (4%) respondents commented on issues related to cycle facilities:
- 22 (3%) respondents commented on the introduction of segregated cycle facilities at the junction:
  - 12 supported the proposed segregated facilities
  - Six said more segregation should be provided - in place of the advanced stop lines on Bishop’s Bridge Road, and for northbound cyclists on Westbourne Terrace approaching Bishop’s Bridge Road. The sections of mandatory cycle lane should also be segregated
  - Four respondents opposed the proposed segregated facilities
- 13 respondents identified elements of the proposed cycle facilities for the junction could be improved, namely:
  - Segregation for northbound cyclists on Westbourne Terrace through Bishop’s Bridge junction - to address the risk of left-turning traffic
  - Separate signal phases for cyclists instead of advanced stop lines on the Bishop’s Bridge Road and Westbourne Terrace junction
  - A two-stage right turn for eastbound cyclists turning right into Westbourne Terrace from Bishop’s Bridge Road
- One respondent said this should be a yellow box junction to ensure queuing traffic does not block cyclists

Pedestrian crossings
2 (<1%) respondents commented on the pedestrian crossings at the junction of Bishop’s Bridge Road and Westbourne Terrace, saying the crossings should be straight-across and follow pedestrian desire lines.
Q8: ‘Do you have any comments about our proposals for the Bishop’s Bridge Road-Gloucester Terrace junction?’

138 (16%) respondents provided comments, and the issues raised are summarised below. Percentages are calculated from all 847 consultation respondents.

**Cycle facilities**
37 (4%) respondents commented on issues related to cycle facilities at the junction:
- 18 (2%) respondents said more substantial cycle facilities should be provided at this junction, such as segregation and separate signal phases
- 13 respondents said providing Advanced Stop Lines at this junction was not enough to address risk of conflict between cyclists and left-turning vehicles
- Seven respondents expressed concern that the proposals gave too much priority to cyclists, and more should be done for other road users
- Other comments included:
  - introducing a one-way gyratory system on Westbourne Terrace southbound, Bishops Bridge Road eastbound and Gloucester Terrace northbound to reduce conflict with turning vehicles
  - restricting the width of Advanced Stop Lines to one traffic lane only to improve vehicle flow through the junction
  - introducing right-turn facilities to help cyclists, i.e. a two-stage right turn

**Impact on traffic**
36 (4%) respondents commented on the potential impact of the proposals on traffic and congestion:
- 29 respondents said it would lead to increased traffic congestion. Additional traffic would displace from Bishop’s Bridge Road westbound into Gloucester Terrace northbound once this right turn is allowed, and the right turn from Bishop’s Bridge Road westbound into Westbourne Terrace is banned
- Nine respondents said the proposals would lead to an increase in air pollution due to traffic congestion at the junction
- Four respondents stated the proposals would cause longer journey times for road users through the junction
- Three respondents said no turning movements should be banned to provide additional cycle facilities
- Respondents were concerned about the impact of the proposals on buses and coaches, and said additional traffic modelling is required

**Cycle safety**
20 (2%) respondents commented on issues related to cycle safety:
• Eight respondents stated the proposals would be more dangerous for cyclists than the current road layout
• Seven respondents said the proposals would improve safety for cyclists
• Two respondents noted that they do not feel the current road layout is safe
• One respondent suggested the speed limit should be lowered to 20 miles per hour to improve safety for all road users
• One respondent expressed concern that merging cyclists and general traffic at the junction approaches increased the risk of collisions and other accidents

Cost
Six (1%) respondents objected to the proposals due to cost, and felt the money would be better spent elsewhere, for example improving the road network or funding public transport.

Cyclist behaviour
Three (<1%) respondents opposed the proposals, citing poor cyclist behaviour. Reasons given included cycling on the pavement, not using bicycle lights, running red lights and slowing down traffic

Q10: ‘Do you have any comments about our proposals for Westbourne Bridge to Harrow Road slip?’

159 (19%) respondents provided comments, and the issues raised are summarised below. Percentages are calculated from all 847 consultation respondents.

Cycle facilities
59 (7%) respondents commented on issues related to cycle facilities on Westbourne Bridge and the Harrow Road slip:
• 15 respondents made general comments in support of proposed segregated facilities. (Five made general negative comments).
• 11 respondents commented on the 1.8m segregating barrier on the Harrow Road slip. They said it should be strong enough to withstand vehicle collisions and tall enough to protect cyclists from traffic fumes, spray and air turbulence. One respondent thought a barrier would not encourage cyclists to use the elevated cycle track, as they would still be intimidated by passing traffic.
• Eight respondents said the proposed cycle track width of 2.6-3.0 metres was insufficient, and should be wider.
• Seven respondents said more should be done for cyclists wishing to access the East-West route at the Westbourne Bridge and Harrow Road junction. They raised the following issues:
  o Risk of conflict between cyclists continuing along the East-West route and those joining or leaving it via the Harrow Road cycle link
  o No facilities for cyclists wishing to travel westbound along Harrow Road
Access for cyclists travelling eastbound along Harrow Road. (In the proposals, cyclists would have to progress to the shared space and traffic island at Westbourne Terrace Road junction)

Better links to Cycle Superhighway 11 and local cycle routes north and west of Westbourne Bridge

- Six respondents commented on the removal of the traffic island and a southbound traffic lane on Westbourne Bridge to provide space for the two-way cycle track. (Four opposed the measures, two supported them).
- Four respondents expressed concern at the Harrow Road slip gradient, and the difficulty it would cause cyclists entering/exiting the elevated cycle track
- Three respondents opposed using shared space, as it increases the risk of conflict between cyclists and pedestrians
- Two respondents supported using shared space at this junction, as it would provide better cycle links between central London and Westbourne Green, Little Venice and Maida Vale
- Two respondents supported the new signalised pedestrian and pedestrian/cycle crossings

Impact on traffic
23 (3%) respondents commented on the potential impact of the proposals on traffic and congestion:

- 16 respondents said they would lead to increased traffic congestion, noting the reallocation of a southbound traffic lane
- Nine respondents said congestion would lead to increased air pollution (One respondent said air pollution would reduce as more people cycled).
- Five respondents said they would cause longer journey times for road users
- Two respondents said noise pollution would increase due to traffic congestion
- Two respondents said they would have a negative impact on emergency services, limiting their ability to travel quickly and respond to local incidents
- One respondent said more should be done to maintain two southbound lanes on Westbourne Bridge given current levels of congestion.

Cycle safety
22 (3%) respondents commented on issues related to cycle safety:

- 11 respondents said the proposals would improve safety for cyclists
- Five respondents said they would be more dangerous than the current road layout. (Two said cyclists should not be encouraged to use the Harrow Road and Westbourne Bridge junction due to high traffic volume).
- Three respondents said the current layout of the Harrow Road/Westbourne Terrace junction is not safe for cyclists
Routing, alignment and access
10 (1%) respondents commented on the routing and alignment of the route at the Harrow Road/Westbourne Terrace junction:

- Four respondents said it should provide better cycle access to areas north of Westbourne Bridge, such as Westbourne Park and Little Venice. (One suggested banning left turns from Harrow Road into Westbourne Terrace Road to create a simpler route avoiding shared space)
- Three respondents opposed the route alignment, saying cyclists would not use the cycle track on the elevated structure
- Two respondents suggested additional access points should be provided to the elevated structure:
  - One suggested West Cross roundabout (for Shepherds Bush)
  - One said more access points would be needed for cyclists who forget or are unaware of how to get onto the elevated cycle track
- One respondent said this alignment would encourage more cyclists to travel through Little Venice and would lead to more non-compliant cyclists going eastbound on the one-way section of Blomfield Road
- One respondent said that there was insufficient existing demand for this alignment, as few cyclists use Westbourne Bridge

Cost
Eight (1%) respondents objected to the proposals due to cost, and felt the money would be better spent elsewhere, such as improving the road network or funding public transport.

Cyclist behaviour and ‘road tax’
Six (1%) respondents opposed the proposals - citing poor cyclist behaviour. Reasons given included cycling on the pavement, not using bicycle lights, running red lights and slowing down traffic

- Two respondents said cycle facilities should not progress as cyclists do not pay for the construction and maintenance of roads and cycle tracks

Parking
Two respondents (<1%) commented on issues relating to parking:

- One respondent objected to the removal of parking spaces on Westbourne Terrace Road to allow for new cycle facilities
- One respondent stated that there was no need to remove the three parking spaces on Westbourne Terrace northbound, as cyclists would use the traffic lane rather than the shared space
Q12: ‘Do you have any comments about our proposals for Harrow Road slip to Westway?’

161 (19%) respondents provided comments, and the issues raised are summarised below. Percentages are calculated from all 847 consultation respondents.

Cycle facilities
54 (6%) respondents commented on issues related to cycle facilities:
- 20 respondents commented on the 1.8m segregating barrier on the elevated Westway. They said it should be strong enough to withstand vehicle collisions and tall enough to stop fumes spray and air turbulence reaching cyclists
  - Two requested more details of the barrier, such as materials to be used and maintenance requirements
  - Two said a barrier was not enough to encourage cyclists to use the elevated cycle track, they would be intimidated by the passing traffic and weather conditions
- 16 respondents said the proposed cycle track width of 2.6 metre-wide was insufficient, and should be wider
  - Six stated the width of the two-way track should be at least 3 metres
  - Three noted a risk of conflict or collision on the slip road between eastbound cyclists travelling quickly and westbound cyclists travelling slowly. The two-way track should be widened to mitigate this
- Nine respondents made general comments in support of segregated facilities, stating that they would encourage more people to cycle
  - Four made general comments about the proposed segregated facilities
- Five respondents expressed concern at the Harrow Road slip gradient, and the difficulty it would cause cyclists entering/exit the elevated cycle track
  - Two said many westbound cyclists would be forced to push their bicycles up the track because of the steep gradient
- One respondent suggested that planters be provided beside the cycle track to improve air quality

Impact on traffic
37 (4%) respondents commented on the potential impact of the proposals on traffic and congestion:
- 23 respondents said the proposals would lead to increased traffic congestion, highlighting the reduction of roadspace on the slip road to one traffic lane
  - Four said the proposals would increase traffic volumes on roads in the surrounding area. Drivers would avoid using the elevated Westway due to traffic congestion and increased journey times and seek other routes
  - Two said the capacity reduction would make the exit unsafe for traffic
- 12 respondents opposed the reallocation of roadspace from traffic to cyclists
Seven commented that the A40 Westway is a heavily-used road, and any loss of capacity should be avoided.

One said that the cycle tracks would only be used during peak hours, while the A40 is busy throughout the day.

- 12 respondents expressed concern that the proposals would lead to an increase in air pollution due to traffic congestion.
  - Two said the proposals would lead to a decrease in air pollution as they would encourage more people to cycle.

- Seven respondents stated that the proposals would cause longer journey times for road users through the area.
- Three respondents called for more data to be provided on potential traffic impacts, including strategic modelling and traffic reassignment.
- One respondent expressed concern at the impact on traffic of the construction of the cycle facilities.
- One respondent said the proposals would have a negative impact for emergency services, and limit their ability to travel through the area and respond to local incidents.

**Cyclist safety / health**

15 (2%) respondents commented on cycle safety:

- Nine respondents said the proposals would improve safety for cyclists.
  - Four said the proposals would be more dangerous for cyclists.
- Two respondents expressed concern that cyclists would be exposed to higher levels of vehicle exhaust emissions while cycling on the elevated Westway.

**Routing, alignment and access**

11 (1%) respondents commented on the routing and alignment of the route:

- Eight respondents suggested additional access points should be provided to the elevated structure.
  - Two said it should provide better access to areas like Westbourne Park, Little Venice, Ladbroke Grove and Great Western Road.
  - One identified the West Cross roundabout as a suitable location, as it would provide easier access to Shepherd’s Bush.
- Four respondents said the scheme should provide cycle routes at street level, to cater for shorter cycle journeys and to reflect existing and future demand.
  - One said that the route should be aligned along Uxbridge Road.

**Cyclist behaviour and ‘road tax’**

Six (1%) respondents opposed the proposals, citing poor cyclist behaviour. Reasons given included cycling on the pavement, not using bicycle lights, running red lights and slowing down traffic.

- Two respondents stated that the cycle facilities should not progress as cyclists do not pay for the construction and maintenance of roads and cycle tracks.
Cost
Five (1%) respondents objected to the proposals due to cost, and felt the money would be better spent elsewhere, such as improving the road network or funding public transport.

Q14: ‘Do you have any comments about our proposals for the Westway (Harrow Road slip to West Cross Roundabout)?’

182 (21%) respondents provided comments, and the issues raised are summarised below. Percentages are calculated from all 847 consultation respondents.

Impact on traffic
64 (8%) respondents commented on the potential impact on traffic and congestion:
- 40 respondents said the proposals would lead to increased congestion. This would increase traffic volumes on roads in the surrounding area. Drivers would avoid using the elevated Westway due to traffic congestion and increased journey times, and would seek other routes
- 15 respondents expressed concern at the impact the proposals would have on a major route into west and central London
- 15 respondents opposed the reallocation of roadspace from traffic to cyclists
- 11 respondents said the proposals would cause longer journey times for road users through the area
- Nine respondents expressed concern that the proposals would lead to an increase in air pollution due to traffic congestion
- Seven respondents suggested that the cycle track should be built alongside the elevated structure - by erecting a cantilevered structure, this would eliminate much of the expected impact on traffic of the scheme
- Four respondents said the scheme should be revised to take greater account of the current and future traffic volumes visiting Westfield
- Two respondents said that the proposals would have a negative impact on the emergency services, and limit their ability to travel through the area and respond to local incidents. Recovery of broken down vehicles would also be made more difficult by the removal of a traffic lane
- Two respondents said that, if required, a westbound traffic lane should be removed as this would lessen the overall traffic impact of the scheme
- One respondent said the eastbound half of the Westway should be rebuilt to provide three eastbound traffic lanes and a segregated cycle track. If that was not possible, the central reservation should be moved to accommodate two widened traffic lanes in each direction, allowing higher speeds
- One respondent said noise pollution would increase due to traffic congestion
- One respondent expressed concern that the construction of the cycle facilities would have on traffic
• One respondent called for more data to be provided on potential traffic impacts, including strategic modelling and traffic realignment

Routing, alignment and access
51 (6%) respondents commented on the routing and alignment of the route:

• 20 respondents made general negative comments opposing the alignment of the East-West route along the elevated Westway
• 20 respondents said the scheme should provide cycle routes at street level, to cater for shorter cycle journeys and reflect existing and future demand. Ramps or elevators would provide better access to Westbourne Park, Little Venice, Ladbroke Grove and Great Western Road
• Ten respondents said the proposals represented too much provision for cyclists, disproportionate to the demand
• Seven respondents said cycling conditions would be unattractive - being adjacent to a five-lane motorway. Cyclists would be intimidated by traffic and affected by noise and air pollution, and use other routes
• Three respondents said the scheme should provide cycle routes at street level, to cater for shorter journeys and reflect existing and future demand
• Three respondents made general positive comments supporting the alignment of the East-West route along the elevated Westway

Cycle facilities
42 (5%) respondents commented on issues related to cycle facilities:

• 24 respondents commented on the 1.8m segregating barrier on the elevated Westway. They said the barrier should be strong enough to withstand vehicle collisions, and tall enough to stop exhaust fumes spray and air turbulence reaching cyclists
  o Two respondents wanted more details - such as materials to be used and maintenance requirements
  o Two respondents said the barrier would be insufficient to encourage cyclists to use the elevated cycle track, as they would be intimidated by the passing traffic and weather conditions
  o One respondent suggested local artists be allowed to decorate the wall
• 12 respondents said the exterior parapet should be raised to prevent cyclists from jumping or falling off the elevated structure
• Seven respondents made general positive comments supporting the installation of segregated cycle facilities along the elevated Westway
• Five respondents commented that the proposed cycle track width of 3.0 metre-wide should be wider
• Two respondents said lighting should be sufficient for wayfinding and provide cyclists with a sense of security, particularly at night
• One respondent said that the lighting columns beside the cycle track would cause light pollution, which would have an impact on buildings and residents near to the elevated structure
• One respondent requested cycle repair stations with drinking water be provided along the elevated cycle track
• One respondent suggested that planters be provided beside the cycle track to improve air quality
• One respondent requested more segregated cycle facilities be installed. The respondent also suggested West Cross Roundabout be converted into a three-arm junction, with segregation and separate signal phases for cyclists

Cycle safety/health
14 (2%) respondents commented on issues related to cycle safety and health:
• Seven respondents expressed concern at cyclists’ exposure to air pollution on the elevated structure, and questioned whether this could be exacerbated by the cycle track being between the barrier and parapet
• Five respondents stated that the proposals would improve safety for cyclists
• Two respondents stated that the proposals would be more dangerous for cyclists than the current road layout. Cyclists should not be encouraged to use the cycle track on the elevated Westway due to the high traffic volume

Cost
Six (1%) respondents objected to the proposals due to cost, and felt the money would be better spent elsewhere, such as improving the road network or funding public transport.

Cyclist behaviour and ‘road tax’
Four (<1%) respondents opposed the proposals, citing poor cyclist behaviour. Reasons given included cycling on the pavement, not using bicycle lights, running red lights and slowing down traffic
• One respondent stated that the cycle facilities should not progress as cyclists do not pay for the construction and maintenance of roads and cycle tracks

Q16: ‘Do you have any comments about our proposals for West Cross Roundabout to Wood Lane slip?’

144 (17%) respondents provided comments, and the issues raised are summarised below. Percentages are calculated from all 847 consultation respondents.

Impact on traffic
45 (5%) respondents commented on the potential impact of the proposals on traffic and congestion:
• 25 respondents said the proposals would lead to increased traffic congestion. They would increase traffic volumes on roads in the surrounding area. Drivers
would avoid using the elevated Westway due to traffic congestion and increased journey times, and would seek other routes

- 21 respondents opposed the reallocation of roadspace from traffic to cyclists
- Ten respondents expressed concern that the proposals would lead to an increase in air pollution due to traffic congestion
- Five respondents said the proposals would have a negative impact on Westfield and other local businesses, due to increased traffic congestion. Visitors are less likely to visit the area if journey times increase significantly
- Five respondents supported reallocation of roadspace from traffic to cyclists
- Five respondents said the proposals would cause longer journey times for road users through the area
- Four respondents expressed concern at the impact of proposals on a major route into west and central London
- Two respondents said the proposals would have a negative impact on the operation of the West Cross Roundabout:
  - One said that existing sight lines are poor for vehicles approaching the roundabout, which can lead to collisions. Reallocation of a traffic lane would reduce capacity and may lead to more collisions
  - One said congestion at the Holland Park Roundabout has a knock-on impact at the West Cross Roundabout. Reducing traffic capacity to provide space for cycle facilities would worsen this issue
- One respondent said that noise pollution would increase due to congestion
- One respondent called for more data to be provided on potential traffic impacts, including strategic modelling and traffic reassignment
- One respondent said the proposals would have a negative impact on the emergency services, limiting their ability to travel through the area and respond to local incidents. Recovery of broken down vehicles would also be made more difficult by the removal of a general traffic lane
- One respondent suggested the proposals be trialled with cones, which would demonstrate their impact on traffic

**Cycle facilities**

36 (4%) respondents commented on issues related to cycle facilities:

- 16 respondents commented on the 1.8m segregating barrier on the elevated Westway. The comments stated that the barrier should be strong enough to withstand collisions with vehicles, and tall enough to prevent exhaust fumes spray and air turbulence generated by passing vehicles from reaching cyclists
  - Two respondents requested more details of the barrier, such as materials to be used and maintenance requirements
  - Two respondents said the barrier would be insufficient to encourage many cyclists to use the elevated cycle track, as they would be intimidated by the passing traffic and weather conditions
• 13 respondents said the proposed cycle track width of 2.6 metre-wide was insufficient, and should be wider
  o Six said the width of the two-way track should be at least 3 metres
  o One said there would be a risk of conflict or collision because of the narrow two-way track. It should be widened to mitigate this
• Eight respondents made general positive comments supporting the installation of segregated cycle facilities
• One respondent expressed concern at the gradient of the Wood Lane slip, causing difficulty for cyclists entering and exiting the elevated cycle track
• One respondent supported the provision of segregated cycle tracks, as it would encourage more people to travel by bicycle
• One respondent requested cycle repair stations with drinking water be provided along the elevated cycle track

Routing, alignment and access
14 (2%) respondents commented on the routing and alignment of the route:
• Eight respondents said the East-West route should be extended either north or south from the West Cross roundabout
  o Three said that the route should be extended to Latimer Road
  o Two suggested the northern stubs of the roundabout be used to provide access ramps
  o One said the route should be extended to Westfield and Holland Park roundabout
• Three respondents said the scheme should provide cycle routes at street level, to cater for shorter journeys and reflect existing and future demand
  o One said the route should be aligned via Bayswater/Ladbroke Grove
  o One identified Uxbridge Road as a better alternative at street level
• Three respondents said that the proposals represented too much provision for cyclists, disproportionate to the demand

Cycle safety/health
Nine (1%) respondents commented on issues related to cycle safety and health:
• Four respondents said the proposals would improve safety for cyclists
• Four respondents said the proposals would be more dangerous for cyclists than the current road layout. Cyclists should not be encouraged to use the cycle track on the elevated Westway due to the high traffic volume
• Two respondents expressed concern at the exposure of cyclists to air pollution on the elevated structure, and questioned whether this could be exacerbated by the cycle track being between the barrier and parapet
Cost
Three (<1%) respondents objected to the proposals due to cost, and felt the money would be better spent elsewhere, such as improving the road network or funding public transport.

Cyclist behaviour and ‘road tax’
Three (<1%) respondents opposed the proposals, citing poor cyclist behaviour. Reasons given included cycling on the pavement, not using bicycle lights, running red lights and slowing down traffic
  - Two respondents said cycle facilities should not progress as cyclists do not pay for the construction and maintenance of roads and cycle tracks

Question 18: ‘Do you have any comments about our proposals for Wood Lane junction?’

171 (20%) respondents provided comments, and the issues raised are summarised below. Percentages are calculated from all 847 consultation respondents.

Cycle facilities
64 (8%) respondents commented on issues related to cycle facilities at the Wood Lane junction:
  - 14 respondents expressed concern at the use of shared space, stating that it increases the risk of conflict between cyclists and pedestrians
    - One noted that the amount of available space under the flyover is limited by the supporting pillars
  - 12 respondents said more segregation should be installed. Suggested locations included alongside the Wood Lane junction traffic islands, and instead of the shared-use footway alongside the Wood Lane on-slip
  - Seven respondents said the segregating barrier should be extended to Wood Lane junction. This would give cyclists additional protection, and prevent westbound cyclists using the Westway on-slip as a shortcut
  - Seven respondents made general comments supporting segregated facilities
    - Five respondents made general negative comments about the proposed segregated facilities
  - Five respondents expressed concern at the potential left-hook risk for northbound and southbound cyclists on Wood Lane and suggested measures such as separate cycle signal phases should be considered
    - Two said existing Advanced Stop Lines should stay to mitigate this risk
  - Four respondents said routing for cyclists wishing to cross the junction was complicated. Clear and helpful signage and wayfinding would be required
  - Two respondents said the width of both the one-way and two-way cycle tracks was too narrow
Impact on traffic
45 (5%) respondents commented on the potential impact of the proposals on traffic and congestion:

- 31 respondents said the proposals would lead to increased traffic congestion. They would increase traffic volumes on roads in the surrounding area. Drivers would avoid using the Wood Lane junction and the elevated Westway due to traffic congestion and increased journey times, and would seek other routes
- 13 respondents opposed reallocation of roadspace from traffic to cyclists
  - Nine said the proposals did not take into account the impact on bus and coach passengers
- 12 respondents commented that the proposals represented too much provision for cyclists, disproportionate to the need
- 11 respondents said proposals would cause longer journey times for road users through the area
- Ten respondents said increased traffic congestion would have a negative impact on Westfield, other local businesses and Queen’s Park Rangers football club. Visitors are less likely to travel to the area if journey times increase significantly
- Seven respondents expressed concern that the proposals would lead to an increase in air pollution due to traffic congestion
- Three respondents said noise pollution would increase due to congestion
- Two respondents called for more data to be provided on potential traffic impacts, including strategic modelling and traffic reassignment
- Two respondents expressed concern that queuing traffic would block the Wood Lane junction and the proposed diagonal cycle crossing
- One respondent suggested the proposals be trialled with cones, which would demonstrate their impact on traffic

Cycle safety
36 (11%) respondents commented on issues related to cycle safety:

- 13 respondents said the proposals would improve safety for cyclists
- 11 respondents said the proposals made cycling conditions less safe for cyclists due to the risk of cyclist/pedestrian conflict
- Nine respondents said the proposals would be more dangerous for cyclists than the current road layout - lack of segregated facilities through the junction
- Three respondents expressed concern at cyclists’ exposure to air pollution

Routeing, alignment and access
25 (3%) respondents commented on routeing and alignment at Wood Lane junction:

- 16 respondents said segregated cycle facilities should be extended from the junction along Wood Lane and the A40 Westway. The proposals should provide better cycle access to Shepherd’s Bush, and Westfield, and link to
cycle lanes on Scrubs Lane, Du Cane Road, South Africa Road and Bloemfontein Road

- Nine respondents said that there was insufficient demand for this alignment. Few cyclists would choose to use a cycle track on the elevated Westway rather than their current routes
- One respondent said the scheme should provide cycle routes at street level, to cater for shorter journeys and reflect existing and future demand. To this end, it should be aligned along Uxbridge Road and Bayswater Road

**Pedestrian facilities**

15 (2%) respondents commented on the pedestrian facilities:

- 11 respondents were concerned about the reduction in service levels for pedestrians, fewer crossings and pavements becoming shared-use footways
- Four respondents said the proposed layout of the signalised crossings was inconvenient for pedestrians and they would continue to cross the arms of the Wood Lane junction according to the walking desire lines
- One respondent suggested that a pedestrian crossing be marked out in parallel with the diagonal cycle crossing
- One respondent questioned whether the removal of the southern signalised pedestrian crossing could be justified by the benefits to cyclists

**Cost**

Six (1%) respondents objected to the proposals due to cost, and felt the money would be better spent elsewhere, such as improving the road network or funding public transport.

**Cyclist behaviour and ‘road tax’**

Two (<1%) respondents opposed the proposals, citing poor cyclist behaviour. They stated that the cycle facilities should not progress as cyclists do not pay for the construction and maintenance of roads and cycle tracks.
Appendix B: TfL response to issues commonly raised (overall proposals)

Route alignment, connectivity and access
A number of respondents asked why the proposed route alignment used the elevated A40 Westway, highlighting how alternative routes at street level would cater for journeys over a range of distances and destinations and offer greater connectivity to existing cycle routes in the wider west London area. Some respondents also requested that cyclists be given access at midpoints such as Westbourne Park and Ladbroke Grove. Others expressed concern at the steep gradient of the on- and off-slips, and the challenge this would pose to cyclists.

We are assessing the feasibility of an alternative route along Bayswater Road, Notting Hill Gate, Holland Park Avenue and Wood Lane, ensuring shop frontage requirements and local accesses are taken into account. This alignment was identified as a key corridor by our Strategic Cycling Analysis (published June 2017).

Cycle routes away from main roads
Some respondents called for cycle routes to be built away from arterial roads or major junctions in order to minimise their impact on motor traffic. Whenever we design a cycle route, we aim to find the best balance between factors such as directness, capacity, comfort, and impact on other transport modes. In some instances, the optimum solution involves aligning a route along a major road or through a major junction. In other instances, the best solution is found using another route such as through a park or along a relatively minor road. We will continue to look at each route on a case-by-case basis, with the long-term aim of creating a safer, comfortable, high-capacity cycling network across Greater London.

Comment on cycling strategy

Benefits of cycling schemes
Some respondents questioned our rationale for building Cycle Superhighways, claiming there is no justification for the East-West Cycle Superhighway from Paddington to Wood Lane, or similar cycling schemes in Greater London.

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

The package of measures to improve transport in the city includes major projects such as upgrades to London Underground, the Overground, the Elizabeth Line (Crossrail) and Crossrail 2. Within this programme £2 billion will be spent on creating Healthy Streets, including investment in walking, cycling and improving public spaces and air quality. The Cycle Superhighways form part of our investment programme, which will improve our roads for everyone. As well as improving cycling provision, we are planning numerous transformational projects to provide better roads, junctions, bridges and tunnels, along with a major bus priority programme.

The roads investment programme will also see upgraded traffic signals, new pedestrian crossings, trees and expanded footways and urban realm projects. This programme of works represents the biggest investment in London's roads in a generation, and is a core part of our strategy to prepare Greater London for the expected population growth.

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

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

Cycling and health

Lack of physical activity is currently one of the biggest threats to the health of Londoners. It is needed for the healthy functioning of every part of the human body and reduces the risk of dying prematurely and developing a range of chronic diseases including diabetes, dementia, depression and the two biggest killers in London, heart disease and cancer. Active travel is likely to be the main way many
people in London meet their physical activity needs because it is easily incorporated into their daily routine. It has been estimated that 60,000 years of perfect health could be gained each year across London’s population if people swapped motorised modes for those short journeys that could realistically be walked or cycled instead. This can be monetised as over £2 billion each year in health economic benefits.

Levels of local cycling

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

Nearly half of car trips made by London residents could be cycled in around ten minutes, and two-thirds in under 20 minutes. Encouraging people to walk or cycle these journeys is important to free up road space for vital journeys – e.g. those vehicles that are carrying large quantities of goods or drivers unable to use other modes such as public transport, walking or cycling.

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

In 2015 (the latest year for which figures are available), there were 670,000 cycle journey stages, which is a 3.5 per cent increase on 2014, and follows a 10.3 per cent increase in the previous year, with an overall 61 per cent increase in cycle stages since 2005 and a 133 percent increase since 2000. This is equivalent to one-fifth of all daily Underground trips, or slightly more than the number of trips on the Bakerloo, Circle and Hammersmith & City lines combined. In Zone 1, during the morning rush hour, 32 per cent of all vehicles on the roads are now bicycles. On some main roads in central London, up to 70 per cent of vehicles are bicycles. If trends continue, the number of people commuting to central London by bicycle will overtake the number commuting by car by 2019.

---


2 A cycle trip is defined as a one-way movement to achieve a specific purpose that is conducted entirely by bike. A cycle journey stage includes these trips, but also includes shorter cycle legs undertaken as part of a longer trip using another mode – for example, cycling to a station to catch a train. Cycle journey stages therefore give the best indication of total cycling activity.
Existing cycling facilities
Some respondents claimed that there was no justification for building the East-West route because existing cycling facilities, such as the newest Cycle Superhighways, are not well used.

Our evaluations of the newest Cycle Superhighways, such as the East-West Superhighway along the Embankment and Cycle Superhighway 5 through Vauxhall, are still in progress, but early evidence from cycle counts on these routes is very positive.

Initial counts suggest the vast majority of cyclists are using the new facilities, with more than 90 per cent using the segregated tracks on both the East-West and North-South routes, and that the routes are well used:
- On Victoria Embankment, the number of cyclists increased on the East-West route by 54 per cent against pre-construction figures. At its busiest, cyclists made up 52 per cent of all traffic.
- On Blackfriars Bridge on the North-South route the number of cyclists increased by 55 per cent against pre-construction figures. At its busiest, cyclists made up 70 per cent of all traffic.
- On Vauxhall Bridge on Cycle Superhighway 5, the number of cyclists increased by 73 per cent against pre-construction figures.

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

Safety, or perception of safety, is highlighted as the main reason both would-be and existing cyclists give about why they don't cycle, or don't cycle more. Cyclists willing to ride in ‘unprotected’ heavy traffic represent a small proportion of the population and these individuals are likely to already be out on the roads.

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

---

The proposals are designed to provide a high-quality cycling environment that is welcoming to people who do not currently cycle, as well as attracting existing cyclists. Women, children and older people are currently under-represented among those who cycle in London. We would have expected the East-West Cycle Superhighway from Paddington to Wood Lane to encourage more people to take up cycling along the route.

**Cycling is seasonal and weather-dependent**

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

While we accept that levels of cycling – like levels of walking – do increase and decrease in the short-term according to the weather and climate, evidence shows there have been steady increases in the overall popularity of cycling during the past decade.

Cycling has a major role to play in providing transport options for Londoners, helping to reduce crowding on roads and public transport, and providing healthy and cost-effective transport options for millions of people.

**Cyclist contributions towards road funding**

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

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

**Cycle Superhighways programme causing disruption**

Some respondents expressed concern that the North-South and East-West routes have had a negative impact on motor traffic, and this would be the case with these proposals as well.

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

A full comparison of before and after journey times cannot usually be completed until 12 months after a scheme has completed and traffic signal strategies have been refined. Therefore, we do not yet have a full set of before and after data. However, initial studies of the routes look very positive.

For example on Cycle Superhighway 5, which was completed in November 2015, inbound journey times for motor traffic in the morning peak are approximately the same as prior to works. This has been achieved despite the removal of a traffic lane. On North-South, southbound journey times have already reduced to approximately what was experienced before construction. Northbound journey times remain slightly longer than pre-construction, and we continue to monitor this.

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

Concerns about cyclist behaviour
Research shows that most cyclists ride responsibly and that cyclists are no more likely to disobey the road rules than other road users.

With the launch of any new cycle route, we undertake a range of engagement and enforcement activity for all road users including cyclists. This includes:

- Representatives from the Metropolitan Police present on site to provide support and assistance to the public. They educate people how to use the new road layout and advise on appropriate behaviour for all road users
- TfL Travel Ambassadors provide assistance and advice to road users and hand out leaflets informing the public about changes to road layouts and the new innovative features

We promote adherence to the Highway Code by all road users and encourage ‘responsible cycling’ and mutual respect between road users. We work to eliminate cycling offences through a combination of Police enforcement and educational programmes.

For example, TfL contributes funding towards the Metropolitan Police’s Cycle Safety Team which patrols the route as part of their normal operations. TfL also works with the Metropolitan Police on Operation Safeway, which sees up to 1,000 officers deployed at around 100 junctions, at least two days every month to tackle dangerous or illegal behaviour by all road users. Between November 2013 when it was
launched and June 2016, over 5,000 Fixed Penalty Notices have been given to cyclists.

**Cyclists endanger themselves**

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

According to a Department for Transport-commissioned report\(^5\), in collisions involving an adult cyclist and a driver, police found the driver to be solely responsible in 60-75% of cases, with the cyclist at fault 17-25% of the time. The study of collisions involving cyclists found that very few cyclists were injured or killed through acting illegally, such as failing to use lights at night or disobeying traffic signals.

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

**Cyclists endanger motorists**

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

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

**Cycle Superhighways and fast cycling**

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

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

---

Impact on safety
Many people felt the proposals would make the route safer for cyclists and pedestrians compared with the existing situation. Others were concerned that the proposals did not go far enough to improve safety for vulnerable road users.

The designs were aimed at improving safety for cyclists as well as other road users through a number of interventions. Collision records have been assessed and proposals focus on addressing safety problems along the route. With all schemes of this nature, we will monitor the completed route to ensure it is operating as expected and to understand whether any further changes may be required.

All schemes are also subject to a thorough Road Safety Audit (RSA) process at each stage of the design and implementation. An RSA considers the road safety implications of all measures proposed, their safety impact on the network under all anticipated operating conditions, and their road safety implications on all types of road user.

Fundamental to the principle of an RSA, is ensuring that due consideration is given to the effects of any scheme on all road users and especially all vulnerable user groups, for example the very young, the elderly, people with a disability and generally, pedestrians, cyclists and riders of powered two wheeled vehicles. This is a continual process throughout the design and construction process.

Impact on the environment
Some respondents felt the proposals would create a better natural and physical environment, lead to less pollution or ease congestion. Others felt the scheme would increase pollution and commented on the impact this could have on health.

Our traffic modelling analysis allows us to review the expected impact to traffic flow and journey times, which have a direct impact on pollution. This scheme would also help contribute to an overall increase in cycling in London which in turn helps to improve the environment and the health of Londoners.

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

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

**Pollution and existing Cycle Superhighways**
Some respondents claimed that the opening of the East-West Cycle Superhighway had caused air quality to deteriorate because of increased motor traffic congestion in roads near the route. They expressed concern that the East-West route from Paddington to Wood Lane would have a similar negative impact on air quality.

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

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

**Value for money**
Some respondents questioned expenditure on this and other cycling schemes. There are a range of impacts that would result from delivering cycling schemes, of which Cycle Superhighways are a central component. These include substantial benefits relating to transport capacity, safety, journey time and cost savings, health, the environment, public realm and gains for businesses.

The costs and benefits of the East-West route proposals form part of the scheme business case, which is used to assess the overall outcomes gained against the cost for the lifetime of the scheme.

**Impact on general motor traffic**
The impact of the proposals on general traffic was a concern for many people who responded to the consultation. We modelled the East-West proposals at both a local and a strategic level in order to understand and minimise their impact on other road users. We will carry out the same traffic modelling process when investigating the feasibility of an alternative alignment.

**Freight and HGVs**
Some respondents expressed concern that we had not considered the needs of the freight industry and the movements of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) when making changes to major arterial routes.
The freight and fleet industry provides a vital role in London, and we worked with them while developing our proposals. We will continue to work closely with them to discuss any outstanding issues and ensure deliveries across London can be made safely and efficiently.

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

We liaised with emergency services to ensure that they were aware of the proposed changes to the road network and that their requirements have been considered. The preliminary design for the barrier on the elevated Westway included gaps to allow access for emergency vehicles.

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

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

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

It is important to recognise that traffic models are predictive tools to improve how we plan, design and operate transport networks. Models are designed to be simplifications of the real world, at a particular moment in time, averaged over an observed period, and are used to evaluate the impacts, both positive and negative, of future network interventions. Traffic models present an offline environment in which numerous design solutions can be tested and appraised with the aim of achieving the optimum balance of benefits and value for money.
Despite the sophistication of our traffic models, all traffic modelling is only ever indicative. It is intended to give an idea of where the impacts of changes in journey choice are most likely to be felt. It assumes that drivers have perfect knowledge of the network and will always choose the quickest route available.

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

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

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

**Transparency of information**

Some respondents expressed concern that we were not transparent with our traffic modelling information, or requested additional data.

We are satisfied that we provided an appropriate level of information to allow consultees to consider the potential traffic impacts of the scheme. We also invited anyone to contact our Traffic Modelling team during the consultation period if they had further questions about the modelling provided on our website or if they wanted more technical data and information underpinning our traffic models. Our approach was to share as much data as was technically feasible, in line with our and the Mayor of London’s broader commitments to Open Data and transparency.

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

Transport for London

Tuesday 9 February 2016

Dear Sir or Madam,

Have your say on a new East-West Cycle Superhighway from Paddington to Acton
We are proposing a continuous cycle route from Paddington to Wood Lane, and improved cycling provision from Wood Lane to Acton. The scheme would extend the existing East-West Cycle Superhighway, which runs from Tower Hill through central London to Paddington.

The enclosed map shows some of the main changes proposed along the route. Detailed proposals and additional information, including predicted traffic impacts, can be viewed at: tfl.gov.uk/east-west-consult.

The proposals from Paddington to Wood Lane include:
- New segregated cycle tracks replace traffic lanes on Westbourne Terrace, Westbourne Bridge and the Westway
- Improved cycle facilities at junctions, including new Advanced Stop Lines, crossings and dedicated signal phases
- Changes to pedestrian facilities, including improvements to crossings and the removal or relocation of others
- Changes to parking and loading, including new double yellow lines on Westbourne Terrace and Bishop’s Bridge Road, and reductions in parking on Cleveland Terrace and Westbourne Terrace Road

The enclosed artist’s impression shows the view looking west along the Westway (elevated section).

The proposals from Wood Lane to Acton include:
- Creation of a continuous route along the A40 from Wood Lane to Acton by upgrading and widening the existing shared-use footway
- Combining two bus stops in two locations and relocating another
- Improvements to pedestrian provision, including new raised crossings, longer crossing times and widened footways

MAYOR OF LONDON
- Reduction in parking and loading at two locations on the A40 Westway
- Widening the westbound A40 slightly at Savoy Circus to provide a third traffic lane

Public exhibitions
We will be holding the following public exhibitions in your area, where you can view the proposals, speak to members of the project team and ask questions. Please check tfl.gov.uk/east-west-consult on the day of the exhibition before travelling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>The Snug @ Paddington Central, Sheldon Square, Paddington, W2 6PY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Tuesday 23 February, 0700-1000  Saturday 27 February, 1100-1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesday 2 March, 1600-2000  Wednesday 9 March, 1600-2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have your say on the proposals
We are inviting comments on the proposals now, so please visit tfl.gov.uk/east-west-consult to find out more and to fill in the online survey. The deadline for comments is Sunday 20 March 2016.

You can also request paper copies of plans and a response form, copies in Braille, large text or another language by emailing consultations@tfl.gov.uk, writing to FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATIONS, or calling 0343 222 1155.

Next steps
We will analyse and consider all of the responses received to the consultation, and publish our response later this year. Construction of the scheme would be subject to the outcome of this consultation, consideration of competing priorities for resources elsewhere on London’s main road network and further relevant approvals.

As part of the Road Modernisation Plan, further work is required to better understand the condition of the elevated Westway. Construction of the East-West Cycle Superhighway on the elevated Westway would depend on the condition of the structure, and would be delayed if any renewal work were required.

Yours faithfully,

Alex Morrison
Consultation Team
Transport for London
Monday 22 February 2016

Dear Sir or Madam,

Have your say on a new East-West Cycle Superhighway from Paddington to Acton
We are proposing a continuous cycle route from Paddington to Wood Lane, and improved cycling provision from Wood Lane to Acton. The scheme would extend the existing East-West Cycle Superhighway, which runs from Tower Hill through central London to Paddington.

Please note, this letter has been reissued to include the second bullet point below (*) on proposed changes to permitted turning movements at the junctions of Bishop’s Bridge Road with Westbourne Terrace and Gloucester Terrace. The enclosed overview map is unchanged, and shows some of the main changes proposed along the route. Detailed proposals and additional information, including predicted traffic impacts, can be viewed at: tfl.gov.uk/east-west-consult.

The proposals from Paddington to Wood Lane include:
- New segregated cycle tracks replace traffic lanes on Westbourne Terrace, Westbourne Bridge and the Westway
- Changes to permitted turning movements at the junctions of Bishop’s Bridge Road with Westbourne Terrace and Gloucester Terrace
- Improved cycle facilities at junctions, including new Advanced Stop Lines, crossings and dedicated signal phases
- Changes to pedestrian facilities, including improvements to crossings and the removal or relocation of others
- Changes to parking and loading, including new double yellow lines on Westbourne Terrace and Bishop’s Bridge Road, and reductions in parking on Cleveland Terrace and Westbourne Terrace Road

The enclosed artist’s impression shows the view looking west along the Westway (elevated section).
The proposals from Wood Lane to Acton include:
- Creation of a continuous route along the A40 from Wood Lane to Acton by upgrading and widening the existing shared-use footway
- Combining two bus stops in two locations and relocating another
- Improvements to pedestrian provision, including new raised crossings, longer crossing times and widened footways
- Reduction in parking and loading at two locations on the A40 Westway
- Widening the westbound A40 slightly at Savoy Circus to provide a third traffic lane

Public exhibitions
We will be holding the following public exhibitions in your area, where you can view the proposals, speak to members of the project team and ask questions. Please check tfl.gov.uk/east-west-consult on the day of the exhibition before travelling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Snug @ Paddington Central, Sheldon Square, Paddington, W2 8PY</td>
<td>Tuesday 23 February, 0700-1000 / Saturday 27 February, 1100-1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesday 2 March, 1600-2000 / Wednesday 9 March, 1600-2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have your say on the proposals
We are inviting comments on the proposals now, so please visit tfl.gov.uk/east-west-consult to find out more and to fill in the online survey. The deadline for comments is Sunday 20 March 2016.

You can also request paper copies of plans and a response form, copies in Braille, large text or another language by emailing consultations@tfl.gov.uk, writing to FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATIONS, or calling 0343 222 1155.

Next steps
We will analyse and consider all of the responses received to the consultation, and publish our response later this year. Construction of the scheme would be subject to the outcome of this consultation, consideration of competing priorities for resources elsewhere on London’s main road network and further relevant approvals.

As part of the Road Modernisation Plan, further work is required to better understand the condition of the elevated Westway. Construction of the East-West Cycle Superhighway on the elevated Westway would depend on the condition of the structure, and would be delayed if any renewal work were required.

Yours faithfully,

Alex Morrison
Consultation Team
Transport for London
Dear recipient,

We would like your views on proposals to extend the existing East-West Cycle Superhighway from Paddington to Acton, using the A40 Westway and Western Avenue. This is part of the Mayor's Vision for Cycling.

For full details and to have your say, please visit tfl.gov.uk/cycling/eastwest

The proposals include new segregated cycle tracks from Paddington to Wood Lane, and upgraded shared use footways from Wood Lane to Acton, providing a direct and safer route for cyclists through west London.

This consultation will run until Sunday 20 March 2016.

Yours sincerely,

Nigel Hardy
Head of Project Sponsorship
Road Space Management

These are our consultation customer service updates. To unsubscribe, please click here.
Appendix E: Summary of stakeholder responses

4.21 Summary of stakeholder responses

This section provides summaries of the feedback we received from stakeholders. The full stakeholder responses are always used for analysis purposes. As well as being summarised here, the stakeholder responses are included in the analysis of overall responses covered in this chapter and in Appendix A.

Each summary begins with a statement explaining the stakeholder’s level of support based on their response to a closed question in our online survey asking respondents to state their support for the proposals. Where this closed question had not been answered, we show our analysts’ interpretation of each respondent’s level of support based on their comments. Where the level of support was not clear from the comments, our analysts put ‘no opinion’. Where we have inferred the level of support, this is stated in the summary below.

4.21.1 Local authorities and statutory bodies

London Borough of Brent

Partially supported the proposals

The Council stated its support for improvements to cycling infrastructure and described some of the schemes that it has collaborated on with TfL to deliver. It supported the principle of the East-West route but felt that opportunities had been missed to integrate the scheme with strategic junctions and cycle routes within the borough. The response included a request to redesign the scheme with these potential connections in mind.

For the section between Westbourne Bridge and the Harrow Road slip, Brent Council expressed disappointment that no improvements had been proposed to the link between Westbourne Bridge and the westbound Harrow Road. It was argued that a screen of 1.8m in height- for the segregated cycle track on the elevated Westway- would fail to provide an attractive riding environment for cyclists. The organisation asked whether it might be possible to use redundant slip road stubs close to the Westway Sports Centre, in order to link the proposed cycle route to local neighbourhoods.

The Council was particularly concerned that the proposed changes at the Wood Lane junction would not provide a good level of service for those who wish to leave the cycle route and travel north, including those who wished to access the segregated cycle track on Wood Lane. It was explained that there are various large
scale residential developments in this area and that the provision of cycling facilities would need to meet that demand. There was a suggestion that the level of service for northbound cyclists at this junction might become worse than is currently the case, unless the proposals are amended. The Council asked for more information on the provision of separate cycle signals, arguing that the consultation material did not sufficiently explain this issue.

**London Borough of Ealing**  
*Supported the proposals*
For the Westbourne Terrace section, Ealing suggested changes that would enable easier cycle access through the Chilworth Street area. They also asked for a cycle contraflow on the one way section of Cleveland Terrace as well as a two-stage right-turn facility.

Ealing argued that the section between Bishop’s Bridge Road and Orsett Terrace could be improved if the signal phasing for southbound cyclists could be arranged so that it was only ever necessary to stop at one of the two stopping points. They also recommended changes for northbound cyclists so that the cycle route did not have to pass through a signalised junction and onto the eastern side of the road.

The Borough suggested that many cyclists would want to access Harrow Road from the Westbourne Bridge/Harrow Road slip section of the route. They pointed out that it would be very difficult to do so for north/westbound cyclists and that more should be done to improve this. Ealing also felt that a width of 2.6m was insufficient for the route onto the elevated Westway, and that a screen of greater than 1m in height was needed to protect cyclists from general traffic. They asked for additional access points to the elevated Westway section and suggested that bike lifts would be the easiest solution.

**London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham**  
*Supported the proposals*
The Borough expressed their support for the aims of the scheme and suggested aspects of the Wood Lane junction proposal that they believed could be improved.

LBHF explained their opinion that the junction arrangement could cause conflict between pedestrians and cyclists exiting the slip road from the Westway. They suggested that the area set aside for shared use was small, that cyclists would be approaching the junction at speed, and that many would cut across onto the shared use area before it was safe to do so. It was recommended that the design be amended to make better use of the available space.

The Council argued that the plans would not make it easy for cyclists to access Wood Lane southbound from the eastbound shared use area, and that the southbound cycle lane should be widened from the current proposal of 1.5m. They
also called for the advisory cycle lane markings on the southbound Wood Lane to extend as far as the mandatory cycle lane markings that begin to the south of the junction with the A40.

**Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea**  
*Did not support the proposals*  
The Borough questioned the level of demand among cyclists for the elevated Westway, and expressed concern over the ability of emergency services vehicles to reach accidents on that section of the route. Of particular concern was the removal of an eastbound traffic lane from the Westway and the potential impacts on journey times into and out of the Borough, including traffic using the Westway itself as well as diversionary routes such as Notting Hill Gate. The organisation explained that it could not support the East-West proposals unless the potential traffic impacts were resolved.

**Westminster City Council**  
*Did not support the proposals*  
The Council felt that traffic modelling information for the proposals had not been fully explained as part of the consultation, and that it would prove difficult for The Active Traffic Management system to control traffic in this area, due to the relatively low level of signalised junctions. In the absence of comprehensive traffic information the Council was not prepared to support the proposals.

WCC were concerned that changes to Westbourne Terrace would lead to congestion and make it more difficult for delivery and refuse collection vehicles to serve the area. They suggested that speed reduction measures be used to make sure cyclists were using the area at safe speeds, and that all road signs should be properly illuminated and designed to ensure the safety of all road users. There was a recommendation for a yellow box at the junction of Westbourne Terrace with Cleveland Terrace.

The Council expressed its concerns over the potential for increased congestion on the eastbound A40 without adequate diversionary routes.

### 4.21.2 Emergency services

**London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA)**  
*No opinion on the proposals*  
LFEPA expressed their support for the Mayor’s Vision for Cycling and their willingness to help deliver this and further cycling schemes across the city. Concern was raised over the reduction of lane space in each direction of Westbourne Terrace, which— it was explained— would affect the ability of fire crews to access a nearby fire brigade station.
It was pointed out that Lord Hills Bridge has already been reduced to one lane traffic and that the proposed changes to Westbourne Terrace would have a cumulative effect for the Brigade’s crews.

There were similar concerns over the proposed lane reduction on the southbound Westbourne Bridge. The organisation suggested that this is already a pinch point for traffic and that the proposed changes would make congestion worse to such an extent that targets for attendance times for fire crews may be missed.

It was suggested that between Bishop’s Bridge Road and Gloucester Terrace the proposals would lead to increased congestion, especially for westbound traffic, and that this might affect attendance times also. LFEPA felt that if a lane was taken away from the eastbound slip road it would be more difficult for fire crews to reach traffic collision points and that target attendance times would be missed.

Further, it was argued that the introduction of removable bollards near the junction of Westbourne Terrace Road with Harrow Road would serve no purpose, because by removing emergency access to Westbourne Terrace southbound it would not be possible for fire crews to reach them. On the elevated Westway, the Authority expressed its belief that the removal of an eastbound lane would cause congestion that would not easily be able to make space for fire crews. Because access to this section of the Westway would only be possible from the northern roundabout, it was suggested that attendance times for fire crews would be severely delayed.

4.21.3 Accessibility groups

Guide Dogs
Partially supported the proposals
The organisation explained that it was opposed to shared use areas under any circumstance.

Wheels for Wellbeing
Partially supported the proposals
The organisation suggested that CCTV and emergency telephones should be installed on the segregated sections of the route, and that measures should be taken to prevent joggers or motorcyclists from using the route.

4.21.4 Transport organisations

Confederation of Passenger Transport UK
Did not support the proposals
CPT warned that transport schemes that do not factor in the needs of buses, coaches and other road users could negatively affect the economy.
It drew attention to the high volume of such vehicles that currently use the Westway and to the importance of the Westway as a route into and out of the city. It acknowledged that segregated cycling would improve the safety of cyclists but suggested that other road users such as motor cyclists would be at increased risk.

The organisation pointed out that the consultation material had suggested additional mitigation measures would be considered for the scheme, and argued that more information on this was needed.

The CPT argued that Westbourne Terrace is unsuited to the proposed lane reduction because of the high volume of residential properties there (which might experience increased congestion and pollution) and because of the hotels that require space for coaches to load and unload. It was suggested that introducing double yellow lines and more restrictive loading arrangements was intended to remove vehicles from the area altogether.

It was argued that, between Bishop’s Bridge Road and Orsett Terrace, the proposed reduction in road capacity would increase congestion for an area popular with tourists and therefore with coach operators. CPT felt that the proposed banned turn from Bishop’s Bridge Road to Westbourne Terrace would force large vehicles to divert to unsuitable routes. Similarly, it was felt that the right turn ban from Bishop’s Bridge Road to Gloucester Road would add to the problem of congestion on surrounding roads, including larger vehicles such as coaches.

Between Westbourne Bridge Road and the Harrow Road slip, the CPT was concerned that any additional congestion would affect traffic flows on the Westway and that accidents may arise from fast flowing traffic drawing closer to congested areas. The organisation also questioned whether the elevated Westway would be a safe or comfortable place for cyclists, particularly in bad weather or in the event of serious accidents on the general traffic lanes. The Confederation took issue with the reduction of lane space on the West Cross roundabout and at the Wood Lane junction, where there are various recent or planned property developments.

**Licensed Taxi Drivers Association**

*Did not support the proposals*

The Association suggested that the proposals on Westbourne Terrace would prevent taxi drivers from serving passengers in that area, particularly those with mobility issues who require special assistance in entering or leaving cabs. They argued that right turns should be allowed at the junction of Bishop’s Bridge Road with Gloucester Terrace, so as to compensate for the banned turns at the Westbourne Terrace junction. The Association expressed a general opposition to the scheme on the basis that it would reduce capacity for motorised traffic on an important route across the city.
London TravelWatch
*Partially support the proposals*
TravelWatch pointed out the risk of cyclist / motorist conflict at side roads and asked for steep ramps inset from the main road.

Sustrans
*Supported the proposals*
Sustrans argued that the junction of Cleveland Terrace and Craven Road should be revised so that a segregated cycle track no longer merges with a left-turn only lane for general traffic. They also felt that there should be some provision for right-turning vehicles at the junction of Westbourne Terrace with Chilworth Street.

Sustrans identified a ‘left hook’ risk on the northbound approach to the junction of Bishop’s Bridge Road with Westbourne Terrace, and recommended that the width of the left turning lane on the eastern approach to Bishop’s Bridge Road be widened.

It was argued that the width of the cycle lanes on the Harrow Road slip needed to be wider, and were concerned that the elevated section of cycle route on the Westway was too isolated and insufficiently connected to local roads and neighbourhoods. They suggested that links to the Westfield shopping centre and the Westway Sports Centre would be useful.

The organisation took the view that the proposed Wood Lane section of the route was overly complex, in particular the interchange from segregated cycle lanes to shared use areas. They felt that the layout may encourage pedestrians to use the cycle crossing point rather than the dedicated pedestrian crossings, and that this may lead to conflict.

The Oxford Tube
*Did not support the proposals*
The Oxford Tube compared the relatively low number of cycle journeys recorded at the Wood Lane junction each day with the 1056 Oxford-London journeys that it operates each week. It was suggested that passengers on these services are already inconvenienced by delays on the A40 and that these would increase in the event of these proposals being implemented. The organisation speculated that it would be a better use of resources to improve off-carriageway cycling facilities that did not add to congestion on roads. There was a second suggestion that a bus and coach lane rather than segregated cycle track would benefit more people than the consultation proposals.
4.21.5 Cycling organisations

**Brent Cyclists (London Cycling Campaign)**

*Supported the proposals*

The group supported the proposals but requested more access points from the Great Western Road and Ladbroke Grove to the elevated section of the route— in the form of new ramps— to help more people make use of it.

For Westbourne Terrace, Brent Cyclists felt that separate cycle signals could be used to eliminate ‘left hook’ risks involving vehicles turning across the path of cyclists traveling across junctions. They suggested that segregated sections should continue to the edge of junctions, rather than merging areas for cyclists and general traffic.

The group was also concerned about left hook risks at the Bishop’s Bridge Road junction. There was a suggestion to extend the section of two way segregated cycle track up to this junction. At the Gloucester Terrace junction it was suggested that ASLs were an insufficient measure, given the level of traffic here.

Brent Cyclists were in full support of the proposed link to Westbourne Terrace Road but suggested other roads in the area that would benefit from upgraded cycling infrastructure in order to fully realise the benefits of the new Super Highway.

It was felt that the 2.6 metre width of the proposed route on the Harrow Road and West Cross roundabout slip roads was insufficient and that 3 metres should be the minimum for any section of a Cycle Superhighway. The organisation was opposed to shared use crossing points and paths around the Wood Lane junction. It argued that this will be an area of high demand for cyclists and that it would cause problems if there was ambiguity between the rights of way for pedestrians and cyclists.

**Bicycle Users Group at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine**

*Supported the proposals*

The group outlined their support for improved cycling infrastructure and the associated health benefits that it could deliver.

**Cycling Works**

*Supported the proposals*

Cycling Works felt that the junctions in the Westbourne Terrace and Bishop’s Bridge Road sections could be made safer for cyclists and that greater levels of segregation could have been provided. At the Wood Lane junction, it was argued that there was enough space to replace the shared use areas with segregated cycle tracks. Cycling Works also suggested that the radius of the northeast corner was too large.
Ealing Cycling Campaign

Supported the proposals
The Campaign explained its support for the proposals but recommended that more be done to screen the segregated section on the elevated Westway from general traffic. It was argued that the screen would need to be at least 2 metres high to fully mitigate the physical and visual effects of fast-moving traffic. The ECC suggested that the width of the track was occasionally less than the recommended dimensions and that the implementation of a screen would limit this further, but argued that effective separation from general traffic was more important.

Kensington and Chelsea Cyclists

Supported the proposals
The group supported the proposals but expressed their concern that it would not prove useful to residents of Kensington and Chelsea because there were few opportunities to leave the route and continue to the south.

London Cycling Campaign

Partially supported the scheme
The London Cycling Campaign (LCC) said that providing a ground-level route instead of the Westway elevated section would allow greater access for cyclists, but that some local councils would oppose a ground-level scheme. It also called for cycling schemes to be given a Cycling Level of Service rating and adhering to the London Cycle Design Standards to eliminate “critical fails” in the design.

Section-specific comments included:

Westbourne Terrace
Partial support. Concerns about hook risks at Cleveland Terrace and called for redesign to eliminate these. Commented on banned turns for cyclists on Westbourne Terrace severing access to Paddington station and nearby Quietways

Bishop’s Bridge Road – Orsett Terrace
Partial support. Concerned over left hook risks at Westbourne Terrace and Bishop’s Bridge Road. LCC suggested extending bi-directional track to the junction.

Bishop’s Bridge Road - Gloucester Terrace
Partial support. LCC suggested separating cyclists in time or space, and enabling easier safer right turns.

Westbourne Bridge to Harrow Road slip
Support. Suggested extending shared use space north of Harrow Road to link with Bourne Terrace, and making Delamere Terrace two-way for cycling to improve link to Grand Union Canal.
**Harrow Road slip to Westway**
Did not support as track too narrow to accommodate increasing numbers of cyclists. Supported a barrier to protect against spray and wind and track at least three metres wide, to accommodate cycle numbers and allow overtaking.

**Westway (Harrow Road slip to West Cross Roundabout)**
Partially supported. LCC would prefer a track wider than 3 metres and a higher barrier. Also concerned about cyclists being isolated and lack of access along the elevated section. It suggested a ramp connecting the Westway to Ladbroke Grove. It also highlighted aspirations under the London Cycling Design Standards for cycle routes at 400 metre intervals.

**West Cross Roundabout to Wood Lane slip**
Did not support. It criticised a track less than three metres wide and highlighted a need for higher screens.

**Wood Lane junction**
Partially supported. It welcomed separation of cycle movements, but concerned about the cycle track being too narrow and the crossings and turnings for pedestrians and cyclists being too complex and subject to delays. It also welcomed hold the left and segregated tracks, but was concerned that the plans do not extend further along Wood Lane as this would attract less confident cyclists and provide better cycling links.

**Westminster Cycling Campaign**

*Supported the proposals*

The Campaign supported the Mayor’s Vision for Cycling and the East-West Cycle Super Highway. It had concerns over the Westbourne Terrace section of the route, which it felt could be improved if the segregated cycle tracks continued all the way to signalised junctions with a dedicated traffic signal for cyclists. There was a related request for improved access to the route from Paddington Station.

It was pointed out that the plans included a banned right turn into Craven Road and Chilworth Street, which would make it difficult to access the station from the proposed route. At the Bishop’s Bridge Road/Orsett Terrace junction it was suggested that the northbound segregated cycle track should continue to the edge of the junction and that there should be separate cycle signals there.

The group asked that more be done to prevent left hook collisions for cyclists entering the junction from either side of Bishop’s Bridge Road and at the junction of Bishop’s Bridge Road with Gloucester Terrace.

The WCC suggested that the section from the Westbourne Bridge to Harrow Road slip could be improved if the shared use area on the north footway of Harrow Road
was extended westward to provide access to cyclists from Bourne Terrace. It was felt that this was of greater importance than the removal of 3 parking spaces in order to allow northbound cyclists access to the shared use area. The group also suggested that eastbound cyclists from the Grand Union Canal should be allowed to access the proposed route via Delamere Terrace. This would require the provision of two-way cycling on the road, which is currently one-way only.

There was support for the proposed route onto and along the elevated section of the Westway, but a request for the route on the Harrow Road slip to be widened to 3.0m.

4.21.6 Businesses, business groups, employers and venues

**AgFe**

*Did not support the proposals*

The organisation explained that its employees preferred to use taxis in order to hold confidential phone calls but that congestion is already forcing them to use the Underground. They felt that the assumed worsening of congestion through these proposals was not justified and that money should be spent on improving dangerous junctions instead.

**Bengal Restaurant**

*Did not support the proposals*

The restaurant noted high traffic volume on the A40 and claimed that cycling was inappropriate and unsafe for busy roads as cyclists did not follow the Highway Code. Also claimed that the scheme was a waste of money.

**Equity Point Hotel**

*No opinion on the proposals*

The hotel voiced its concerns over the potential changes to loading arrangements on Westbourne Terrace. They explained that it would not be possible for large coaches to use the adjacent service roads that other local residents and businesses have access to, and that loading from coaches was of particular importance to them and other hotels in the area. They asked that their requirements be factored into the plans for the East-West route.

**Phoebus Associates**

*Supported the proposals*

The organisation explained its belief that the East-West route would reduce the risk of Uxbridge Road and Holland Park Avenue becoming overcrowded with cyclists.

**Rodney Black Design Studios**

*Supported the proposals*

The business supported the scheme but was concerned that it should take all opportunities to plant new trees and other vegetation along the route. It was
suggested that other sections of the East-West route had failed to take these opportunities.

**RTR Worldwide Ltd**

*Did not support the proposals*

The company felt that Cycle Super Highways should operate at peak times only and suggested that the congestion effects of existing sections of the east-west route had already caused disadvantages to their business.

**Stanhope Plc.**

*Did not support the proposals*

Stanhope raised concerns over the accuracy of the traffic modelling summary included in the consultation, and suggested that some delays caused to traffic on the A40 would be significant.

The organisation also questioned some of the complementary measures that were described in the consultation material but not in sufficient detail to enable full consideration. They also asked for more information on the impacts of construction of the scheme, and how it was proposed that these impacts would be managed.

**Westfield Europe Limited**

*No opinion on the proposals*

Westfield supported improved cycling facilities but stressed need to balance the needs of businesses and road users. General concerns included:

- Claimed lack of detailed analysis of effects of implementing Cycle Superhighways
- Potential impact on customers accessing shopping centre and Shepherds Bush shopping area
- Impact of congestion on residents, transport users, and local freight and servicing businesses

There was also a request for TfL to analyse the traffic impacts and other effects of the scheme more fully, introduce temporary lane closures and measure traffic impacts, and publish this information.

Westfield’s importance in bringing shoppers and employees to the area and its contribution to local economic growth was highlighted. Westfield also gave details of cycle parking provision at Westfield.

Specific concerns included:

- Removal of eastbound land would affect traffic capacity
- Lack of information about cyclist numbers. Requested TfL to provide current and projected cyclist numbers
• Concern over some of the significant modelled increases in journey times and requested more details about modelling data and assumptions and more details about traffic reassignment
•Requested information about impacts of rerouted traffic on bus journey times and a fuller assessment of bus journey times
•Asked for more pedestrian journey time information
•Asked for more detail about complementary measures and why they were not included in the proposal, and whether modelling had identified these locations
•Asked for more construction information, including mitigation measures and freight impacts

4.21.7 Local interest groups

North East Westbourne Residents’ Association

Did not support the proposals

The Association felt that the removal of lane space on Westbourne Terrace would cause traffic problems between the A40 and Hyde Park, and that a road designed as a motorway should not be used for cycling. It was suggested that a single two-way cycle route on the east of Westbourne Terrace would be a preferable route option than the one included in the consultation. There were concerns over the ability of emergency services vehicles to negotiate the additional congestion that was predicted if the proposals are implemented.

Paddington Residents’ Active Concern on Transport (PRACT)

The organisation submitted a detailed response, containing questions about technical aspects of the proposals as well as notes from previous meetings and discussions.

It was suggested that the main justification for segregated cycling on Westbourne Terrace was its connection to the proposed cycle route on the elevated Westway, and on that basis the former should only be implemented if the latter also goes ahead. There was a separate concern over the potential blocking of cycle routes on Westbourne Terrace by vehicles that are too big to use adjacent service roads.

It was pointed out that Crossrail construction has required some bus routes to divert onto Westbourne Terrace, and PRACT argued that it would be inappropriate to increase the volume of cycles on that road while these diversions are continuing. The organisation expressed concerns and asked questions about the provision of signage and ASLs at junctions with service roads and side roads in this area, and about the restrictions on existing loading arrangements. PRACT asked for a yellow junction box for the junction of Cleveland Terrace and Westbourne Terrace, and for better directional road signs there.
Between Bishop’s Bridge Road and Orsett Terrace, the organisation suggested tighter restrictions on loading arrangements. They also requested improved pedestrian crossing facilities for the junction of Gloucester Terrace with Bishop’s Bridge Road.

For the Westbourne Bridge to Harrow Road slip section, PRACT asked what the recommended route would be from the Cycle Superhighway to Harrow Road and whether TfL considered it safe for cyclists to use the Westbourne Bridge. They also asked for measures to deter U-turns or overtaking on Westbourne Bridge.

**St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum**

*No opinion on the proposals*

The Forum explained that it had concerns over the proposed arrangement for joining and leaving the Super Highway from the Wood Lane junction. It was suggested that the plans would lead to potential conflict between cyclists and vehicles, and that cyclists travelling north would choose to use the footway on the eastern side of Wood Lane. The Forum’s suggestion was that cycle lifts be installed at a site close to 301 Latimer Road, which they felt would allow for safer entry and exit points for cyclists, and could provide links to other future cycle routes.

**Swinbrook Residents Association**

*No opinion on the proposals*

The Association would support a cycle lift on Acklam Road to access the Westway providing access for local residents and others to Portobello market. It highlighted that a lift would allow residents to access the Cycle Superhighway and use it as a fitness resource.

However, they were concerned over the noise levels which exceed current legal limits for new residential construction and noted that modern tyres and road surfaces are noisier. Finally, they called for an improved barrier on the south of the cycle way to reduce noise for residents.

**Westway Trust**

*Partially supported the proposals*

The Trust was supportive of more cycle infrastructure and noted lack of cycling infrastructure that would benefit Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (RBKC) residents and lack of access along the elevated Westway section. It also felt that reducing air and noise pollution from motor traffic was necessary and sought assurances that construction would not impact the Trust’s own development plans.
Concerns were raised over lack of access along the elevated Westway section, but the Trust acknowledged the difficulty of providing ramp or lift access. Additionally, the Trust highlighted the lack of access to local businesses and said that access along the Westway section would stimulate the local economy. It would struggle to support a scheme that did not provide such economic benefits.

The Trust was keen to have alternative or additional infrastructure which would allow easier cycling in RBKC at street level and asked TfL and RBKC to publish details of how residents might use the Cycle Superhighway.

Of particular concern was the high level of pollution caused by the Westway and local concerns over noise pollution. The Trust suggested that the increase in journey times would increase air and noise pollution and called for the scheme impact on pollution to be modelled and mitigated if necessary, including traffic reassignment modelling. To partially mitigate the effects, it called for barriers and other features.

Commenting on the expose nature of the elevated section, the Trust suggested it would only appeal to more confident cyclists, while something greener would appeal to more casual and leisure cyclists. To make this section more appealing, it called for the barrier to be of a high standard.