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Executive summary
Between 8 February 2016 and 20 March 2016, we consulted on proposals to improve the existing cycling provision between Wood Lane and Acton, connecting to the proposed scheme 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 445 responses to the consultation on the Wood Lane to Acton section of the route:
- 77 per cent supported or partially supported our proposals
- 19 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:
- Support for the proposed cycle facilities
- Concern about shared-use cycle tracks, and the interaction between cyclists and pedestrians
- Proposals would improve safety for cyclists
- Installation of additional cycle facilities, such as Advanced Stop Lines and cycle parking
- Proposals would cause an increase in general traffic congestion
- Suggestions for alternative route alignments
- Opposition to the proposals in general
- Concern at the width of the proposed cycle tracks
- Improved pedestrian crossing facilities should be installed at Savoy Circus

Our detailed analysis of responses is included as Appendix A.

Responses from stakeholders
We received 20 responses from stakeholders, including 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 upgrading the existing shared pedestrian and cycle facilities along the A40 from Wood Lane to Acton, encouraging more people to walk and cycle.

However, the consultation also highlighted a number of concerns regarding the:
- extent of improvements to the shared-use path
- interaction between pedestrians and cyclists along the route
• pedestrian crossing facilities at Savoy Circus

After considering all responses, we will continue to develop the overall scheme along the route alignment consulted on - with some changes to the detailed proposals. We aim to publish an update on our plans later in 2017, along with our response to the issues raised about the design we consulted on.

Planning for future demand – Wood Lane and Old Oak Common
The area surrounding the A40 Westway/Western Avenue is undergoing significant development and regeneration, at sites such as Old Oak and Park Royal, and Imperial College London’s White City Campus.

These schemes will greatly increase future demand for pedestrian and cycle facilities in the immediate area. We will consider this expected increase when revising our plans.
1. **About the proposals**

1.1 **Introduction**

We proposed a scheme would run from Paddington to Acton. The scheme would be an important part of the wider 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.

Due to the differing proposals for the provision of the sections between Paddington to Wood Lane and Wood Lane to Acton, we consulted separately on each section.
1.2 Purpose
Our proposals would deliver improvements to cycling by upgrading the existing shared use facility for pedestrians and cyclists to provide a direct route from west London into central London. 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 less suitable routes in west London. We would also look to improve pedestrian facilities and the urban environment.

1.3 Summary of the proposed improvements
The scheme would create a continuous route along the A40 from Wood Lane to Acton by upgrading and widening the existing shared-use footway. Additionally, we will improve provision for pedestrians by building raised crossings, increasing crossing times and widening footways.
The key improvements proposed are summarised below.
Full details of the proposals with accompanying diagrams were published online at consultations.tfl.gov.uk/cycling/46da7377.

Proposed improvements for cycling
- Widening existing shared-use footway on southern side of A40 Westway (Wood Lane to Old Oak Road) to provide additional space for cyclists and pedestrians.
- Upgrade to existing cycle track on southern side of A40 Western Avenue (Old Oak Road to Kathleen Avenue)
- New sections of segregated cycle track connecting the existing shared use sections of footway, forming a continuous cycle route

Changes to bus stops and bus routes
- Three existing bus stops moved, with improvements to waiting facilities and accessibility
- Two existing bus stops between Old Oak Common Lane and Foster Road merged to create a single new bus stop designed to accessible standards
- Two existing bus stops between Kathleen Avenue and Park View merged to create a single bus stop designed to accessible standards

Changes to pedestrian facilities and crossings
- A new raised crossing area would be introduced at the junction of Bloemfontein Road with the A40 Westway, replacing the existing crossing.
- The existing pedestrian and cycle crossings along the southern side of Savoy Circus would be simplified to make it quicker and easier to cross
• Pedestrians using the crossing near Glendun Road would get more time to cross
• The existing raised crossings at the junctions of the A40 with Kathleen Avenue, Allan Way, Court Way and Park View would be realigned and widened
• The existing pedestrian and cycle crossings at the junction of Horn Lane would be widened and the crossing on the left slip road would be relocated
• Large sections of the existing footway between Wood Lane and Kathleen Avenue would be widened, providing additional space for segregated cycle lanes and shared-use footway

Changes to parking and loading
• The existing parking bay to the west of Sundew Avenue on the westbound carriageway of the A40 Westway, which provides 99 metres (approximately 16 spaces) of parking, would be removed
• Two sections of parking bays, which currently provide 76 metres (approximately 12 spaces) and 41 metres (approximately six spaces) of parking respectively, would be removed on the westbound carriageway of the A40 Westway between Hemlock Road and Savoy Circus

Impacts
• Likely to mean longer journey times for some motorists, bus, coach and taxi passengers and freight at busy times. We are developing a new traffic management plan to mitigate the impact of this and other schemes, including those proposed by London local authorities and developers
• Some existing movements would be banned for motorists, which may change accessibility for some small areas.
• There could be increased traffic levels and journey times on other local roads due to increased journey times along the East-West Superhighway alignment and/or new traffic restrictions
• There could be longer waits for pedestrians at some signalised crossings
• Potential increase in cyclists on nearby routes feeding from CSEW
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 enable 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 respondents’ concerns and objections
- enable 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 proceed with the scheme with modifications in response to issues raised in consultation
- we decide not to proceed with 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 of the East-West Cycle Superhighway: Hyde Park, St James Park, Green Park, Victoria Embankment/Northumberland Avenue and Lancaster Gate.

We referred to the proposals for the Paddington to Action 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.

Stakeholders consulted included those in the White City Opportunity Area, local councils, transport interest groups and other interest groups. These stakeholders
have been made aware of the proposals and we have had discussions with some stakeholders.
We targeted information at individuals on our customer database who we knew used the route or lived in areas nearby (because they had supplied their postcode to us previously via Oyster, Congestion Charging, Cycle Hire, or for another reason). In this way, we raised awareness of the consultation among motorists, cyclists, bus users and other public transport users.

We sent emails to stakeholders who had been identified as interested in this scheme. These included disability groups, organisations representing the elderly, transport user groups, businesses and major employers, trade organisations, statutory organisations, charities, local government, politicians, residents’ representatives, healthcare providers, sports clubs, educational establishments, and others.
We also provided information about the proposals and consultation to local and regional media.
For a full list of the publicity channels used, please see Section 2.8 below.

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

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

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

Respondents were asked a mandatory question about their level of support for the overall proposals (‘support’, ‘partially support’, ‘don’t support’, ‘not sure’, ‘no opinion’). Respondents were also given an opportunity to comment on the proposals as a free text responses. Respondents were also asked an optional closed question and for a free text response to each section of the route.

Respondents were also asked to submit their name, email address and postcode, along with information about their cycling and other travel habits. All questions were optional, apart from the question asking for overall views on the proposal. Other
information, such as the respondent’s IP address and the date and time of responding, was recorded automatically. All data is held under conditions that conform to the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998. 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 through the following channels:
- By answering the questions in the survey on our consultation website at consultations.tfl.gov.uk/cycling/0e1209f5
- By sending a letter to FREEPOST TfL CONSULTATIONS
- By emailing: consultations@tfl.gov.uk. The Consultation Team also answered questions from members of the public and stakeholders via email
- By phoning our Customer Service Team, which had been briefed on the scheme and were available to answer questions and take responses from members of the public. When our telephone operatives were unable to answer questions immediately, these were forwarded to the Consultation Team, and were answered subsequently by email or telephone
- By 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 the consultation and 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 consultation web page at consultations.tfl.gov.uk/cycling/46da7377 provided explanatory text and a detailed design drawing of the overall proposals and for each section. The materials are available at consultations.tfl.gov.uk/cycling/46da7377.

2.8.2 Letters
A consultation letter explaining the proposals was sent to 12,384 addresses near the scheme area on Tuesday 9 February 2016. Leaflets were also distributed before public events and exhibitions to raise awareness and encourage the public to attend. Copies of the letters and a map of the distribution area can be found in Appendix C.
2.8.3 Leaflets
A consultation leaflet containing details of the proposals and a drawing of the scheme area was distributed near local events before they started. The leaflet was also available at local events.

2.8.4 Emails to public
We emailed over 11,345 people on the TfL database who are known to cycle, drive or use public transport in the area. The data for the distribution list was extracted from our master database of people who have registered their details with us – for example, through use of Congestion Charge, Oyster Card or Cycle Hire services. The email briefly described the proposed scheme, and invited recipients to find out more and respond via the consultation website.

Additionally, on 26 February, we emailed 3134 individuals and organisations who responded to the previous consultation on the East West Cycle Superhighway between Tower Hill and Lancaster Gate.

The text of both emails can be found in Appendix D.

2.8.5 Emails to stakeholders
We emailed 380 different stakeholders and stakeholder organisations to let them know about the consultation. The email contained a brief summary of the proposals and a link to the consultation website.

2.8.6 Press and media activity
A media release announcing the launch of the consultation was sent on 8 February 2016.

2.8.7 Public meetings, events and exhibitions

Public drop-in events
During the consultation period we held 10 public drop-in events, covering proposals for both the Paddington to Wood Lane and the Wood Lane to Acton sections of the route. All were held 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>

### 2.8.9 Meetings with stakeholders
We met a number of external stakeholders ahead of the consultation. These were the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham, the London Borough of Ealing, the Metropolitan Police, and Mistui Fudosan, which is currently redeveloping the BBC White City site.

### 2.9 How we considered equalities in the consultation
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 including but not limited to the 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 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 provided to us in our questionnaire.

3.1 Number of respondents

A total of 445 people responded to the consultation (following the removal of duplicate responses). 372 responses (84%) were submitted through the online consultation portal and a further 73 (16%) were written submissions including emails, paper response forms and letters received by post.

Of the 445 respondents, 425 (96%) were individual members of the public and 20 (4 per cent) were stakeholders or stakeholder organisations. Stakeholder responses are those submitted by individuals who identify themselves as representing political entities, organisations, businesses or campaign groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public responses</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder responses</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>445</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 How respondents heard about the consultation

We asked respondents how they had heard about the consultation. 246 respondents answered this question. Percentages are given as a proportion of the total number of respondents (246) to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received an email from TfL</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the press</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet from a TfL representative</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London / Ealing Cycling Campaign</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received a letter from TfL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TfL website</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family / friend / word of mouth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other website</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Respondent postcodes

Of the 445 respondents, 251 (56 per cent) supplied a postcode. Five postcode areas accounted for 40% of all postcodes provided, as shown below. Percentages are given as a proportion of the total number of responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postcode</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of respondents’ postcodes is shown below.

3.4 Relationship between respondent and scheme area

We asked respondents to describe their relationship to the scheme area using the categories below. They were encouraged to tick one or more categories. 393 responses were recorded. Percentages are given as a proportion of the total number of respondents to this question.
3.5 Modes of transport
We asked respondents to tell us what mode(s) of transport they usually use to travel locally and to tick all options that apply. A total of 1057 modes was recorded.
3.6 Cycle usage
Respondents were asked how often they cycled. 268 respondents answered this 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>per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most days</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a week</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less often</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About 1-3 times a month</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>268</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Types of cycling
We asked respondents who cycle to specify the particular types of cycling they engage in, and to tick all options that apply. We had 452 responses to this question. Percentages are given as a proportion of the total number of responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuting</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. 238 respondents provided comments on the consultation.

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

Negative comments included:
- The consultation website was difficult to use
- Too much detail, making responding slow and cumbersome
4. Summary of all consultation responses

4.1 About this chapter
To get feedback on the scheme, we asked respondents eight closed questions, so they could show their level of support for the overall scheme and for each of the seven sections. We also asked eight open questions which allowed respondents to comment on the overall scheme and each of the seven 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 one question was mandatory for online respondents - the level of support for the overall scheme.

Detailed analysis of all questions can be found in Appendix A.

4.2 Support for overall proposals and sections 1 to 7

<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>297</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 7</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3  Question 1: Do you support the overall proposals for the East-West Cycle Superhighway from Wood Lane to Acton?

445 respondents answered this question. 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 obvious support (or not) for the scheme, our analysts inferred a response based on the comments provided.

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4  Question 2: Do you have any comments on our overall proposals for the Cycle Superhighway from Wood Lane to Acton?

310 (70%) of respondents made comment on the overall proposals. The table below shows the most frequently raised issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General supportive comment</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals would improve safety for cyclists</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose shared use space for pedestrians and cyclists</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More cycling provision needed in scheme</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase segregation or space for cycling</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would increase traffic congestion</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle conflict with other road users</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5 Question 3: Do you support our proposals for Wood Lane to Bloemfontein Road?
217 respondents answered this question. Options to answer were: Yes, Partially, Not sure, No opinion, No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 Question 4: Do you have any comments about our proposals for Wood Lane to Bloemfontein Road?
The table below shows the most frequently raised issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General negative comment</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General positive comment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported segregation or space for cycling rather than a shared use facility</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More cycling provision or space for cycling needs to be provided</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed shared use space</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would increase congestion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle conflict with other road users</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested improving connectivity with other cycle routes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7: Question 5: Do you support our proposals for Bloemfontein Road to Hemlock Road?
209 respondents answered this question. Options to answer were: Yes, Partially, Not sure, No opinion, No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8 Question 6: Do you have any comments about our proposals for Bloemfontein Road to Hemlock Road?
68 respondents answered this question. The table below shows the most frequently raised issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General negative comment</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General positive comment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed shared use space</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported segregation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More cycling provision needed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle conflict with other road users</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would increase congestion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested redesigning this section</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern over cycle lane width</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.9 Question 7: Do you support our proposals for Hemlock Road to Savoy Circus?
212 respondents answered this question. Options to answer were: Yes, Partially, Not sure, No opinion, No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.10 Question 8: Do you have any comments about our proposals for Hemlock Road to Savoy Circus?
67 respondents answered this question. The table below shows the most frequently raised issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally negative comment</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally positive comment</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed shared use space</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported segregation or space for cycling</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Increase congestion</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More cycling provision or space for cycling needs to be provided</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle conflict with other road users</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign this section</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of cycle lane</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would improve experience for cyclists</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste of money</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.11 Question 9: Do you support our proposals for Savoy Circus?
217 respondents answered this question. Options to answer were: Yes, Partially, Not sure, No opinion, No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Not Answered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.12 Question 10: Do you have any comments about our proposals for Savoy Circus?
87 respondents answered this question. The table below shows the most frequently raised issues by respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General negative comment</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported segregation or space for cycling</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More cycling provision or space for cycling should be provided</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign this section</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally positive comment</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do more at Savoy Circus</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle conflict with other road users</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would increase congestion or journey times</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns over shared pedestrian / cycle crossing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.13 Question 11: Do you support our proposals for Savoy Circus to Perryn Road?
208 respondents answered this question. Options to answer were: Yes, Partially, Not sure, No opinion, No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.14 Question 12: Do you have any comments about our proposals for Savoy Circus to Perryn Road?
67 respondents answered this question. The table below shows the most frequently raised issues by respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally negative comment</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally positive comment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported segregation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better cycling provision or space for cycling</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would increase congestion</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle route connectivity should be improved</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority at side roads is required for cyclists</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle lanes not wide enough</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed shared use</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.15 Question 13: Do you support our proposals for Perryn Road to Gypsy Corner?
214 respondents answered this question. Options to answer were: Yes, Partially, Not sure, No opinion, No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.16 Question 14: Do you have any comments about our proposals for Perryn Road to Gypsy Corner?
75 respondents answered this question. The table below shows the most frequently raised issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally positive comment</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally negative comment</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported segregation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would increase congestion or journey times</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve cycling or pedestrian crossings</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregation or space for cycling rather than a shared use facility</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle conflict with other road users</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle track should be continuous</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle route connectivity should be improved</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would improve cycle safety</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.17 Question 15: Do you support our proposals for Gypsy Corner to Kathleen Avenue?
214 respondents answered this question. Options to answer were: Yes, Partially, Not sure, No opinion, No. .

4.18 Question 16: Do you have any comments about our proposals for Gypsy Corner to Kathleen Avenue?
76 respondents answered this question. The table below shows the most frequently raised issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally negative comment</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally positive comment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported segregation or preferred segregation to shared use space for pedestrians and cyclists</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would increase congestion or journey times for motorists</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment about safety</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to pedestrian facilities were needed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More cycling provision or space for cycling should be provided as current provision was inadequate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle route connectivity should be improved</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides better safety for cyclists</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would be a waste of money</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.19 Summary of stakeholder responses
Summaries of stakeholder responses can be found in Appendix E. The full stakeholder responses are always used for analysis purposes.

4.20 Summary of comments from events
Many of the issues raised at events were also raised in consultation responses. However, some attendees at events raised comments specific to the design of the scheme such as concerns over moving the bus stops, the services bus stop at St. Dunstan’s, adding CCTV for safety, and improving lighting on the cycle track.

4.21 Summary of comments from social media
Comments on Twitter mainly drew attention to the launch of both East-West Paddington to Acton consultations and requested followers to respond to the consultations.

Comments on Facebook included links to a summary of the consultation by Ealing Cycling Campaign, comments about the loss of road capacity, general negative comments and calls to respond positively.

4.212 Comments on the consultation
Of the 445 total respondents, 132 respondents (30%) made a comment responded to question 26 about the quality of the consultation material. Percentages below are calculated from the total 445 consultation respondents and rounded to the nearest integer:

- 66 (15%) said that the consultation materials were of good quality
- 16 (4%) said that the consultation was informative
- 15 (3%) felt that the survey should be continuous and not in sections which make respondents return to the main web page
- 13 (3%) stated that materials were clear and concise
- 10 (2%) stated that the consultation materials were adequate
- 10 (2%) stated that more information was required to make an informed judgement
- 7 (2%) felt that their consultation responses would not be considered, citing the length of the consultation or TfL bias as the reason
- 5 (1%) said that consultation contained too much information
- 5 (1%) suggested that clearer maps or more maps were needed
- 4 (1%) said that the consultation was time consuming to read and complete
- 3 (1%) felt that diagrams were good quality
- 1 (<1%) felt that the visualisations provided did not accurately represent the scheme
5. Conclusion and next steps

Between 8 February 2016 and 20 March 2016, we consulted on proposals to improve the existing cycling provision between Wood Lane and Acton, connecting to the proposed scheme 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 445 responses to the consultation on the Wood Lane to Acton section of the route.
- 77 per cent supported or partially supported our proposals
- 19 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:
- Support for the proposed cycle facilities
- Concern about shared-use cycle tracks, and the interaction between cyclists and pedestrians
- Proposals would improve safety for cyclists
- Installation of additional cycle facilities, such as Advanced Stop Lines and cycle parking
- Proposals would cause an increase in general traffic congestion
- Suggestions for alternative route alignments
- Opposition to the proposals in general
- Concern at the width of the proposed cycle tracks
- Improved pedestrian crossing facilities should be installed at Savoy Circus

Our detailed analysis of responses is included as Appendix A.

Conclusion and next steps

The consultation showed strong support for upgrading the existing shared pedestrian and cycle facilities along the A40 from Wood Lane to Acton, encouraging more people to walk and cycle.

However, the consultation also highlighted a number of concerns regarding the:
- extent of improvements to the shared-use path
- interaction between pedestrians and cyclists along the route
- pedestrian crossing facilities at Savoy Circus.

After considering all responses, we will continue to develop the overall scheme along the route alignment consulted on - with some changes to the detailed proposals. We
aim to publish an update on our plans later in 2017, along with our response to the issues raised about the design we consulted on.

Planning for future demand – Wood Lane and Old Oak Common
The area surrounding the A40 Westway/Western Avenue is undergoing significant development and regeneration, at sites such as Old Oak and Park Royal, and Imperial College London’s White City Campus.

These schemes will greatly increase future demand for pedestrian and cycle facilities in the immediate area. We will consider this expected increase when revising our plans.
Appendix A: Detailed analysis of comments

All respondents were invited to provide comments through our open questions, although none were mandatory. In this appendix we summarise the issues raised. For each question, we list the main analysis of themes in descending order of frequency. All percentages below are calculated from all 847 consultation respondents, including stakeholders.

Question 2: ‘Do you have any comments about our overall proposals for the East-West Cycle Superhighway from Wood Lane to Acton?’

Of the 445 total respondents to the consultation, 310 respondents (70 per cent) responded to the question and the issues raised are summarised below.

Cycle facilities
219 (49%) respondents made a comment concerning the cycle facilities proposed. Some respondents made more than one comment. Themes arising included:

Level of provision
219 (22%) respondents made a comment about the level of provision proposed. These included:

- 47 suggested that there should be additional or improved provision for cyclists beyond what is currently proposed
- 35 felt that proposals did not meet the standards of existing Cycle Superhighways or TfL design guidance
- 29 felt that proposals were inadequate or inappropriate for cycling
- 23 said they would like to see more improvements at Savoy Circus
- 20 suggested improving other cycling provision outside this scheme or more general improvements to cycling provision
- 16 were concerned that the scheme over-provided facilities for cyclists compared to other road users
- 14 said that the scheme offered some improvement

Segregation
81 (18%) respondents made a comment about the segregation proposed as part of the scheme. These included:

- 48 called for more segregation of cyclists from motor traffic, including 24 (6%) who supported segregation or space for cycling
- 38 called for segregation rather than shared use space
- 34 suggested a barrier similar to the one on the Westway separating cyclists and pedestrians from motorists
- 3 suggested using a green wall to provide segregation
- 1 opposed segregation

Safety benefits and risks

76 (17%) respondents made a comment about safety. These included:
- 61 felt that the scheme would improve safety for cyclists
- 10 felt that current conditions are too dangerous for cyclists
- 9 said that the proposals would be more dangerous or not improve cyclist safety
- 9 were concerned with cycle collisions on side streets
- 3 were concerned with cyclist and motor traffic conflicts
- 3 were concerned with potential left hook collisions affecting cyclists

Cycle track

71 (16%) commented about the design and facilities of the cycle track. These included:
- 32 were concerned that the cycle lanes would not be wide enough
- 20 said that more design work or changes to designs were needed
- 10 said the route should be clear or continuous
- 8 were concerned about cycle priority at side roads or suggested
- 8 felt that the current route lacked good signage for cyclists or suggested that signage be improved as part of the scheme
- 7 highlighted issues at side roads, including 4 (1%) who suggested closing some side roads on the A40 and 3 (<1%) who highlighted priority for cyclists at side roads
- 9 were concerned with ease of access to the cycle track
- 6 were concerned over the materials used for the road and cycling surface, including 1 (<1%) who suggested improvements to the coloured surface and road markings
- 2 suggested that proposals need to adhere more to the CLOS design guidance
- 3 (suggested that cycle parking provision is required on the route
- 2 said that adequate lighting was needed to improve safety
- 1 suggested that green times should be longer for cyclists

Shared-use space for pedestrians and cyclists

64 (14%) respondents were concerned about the shared use provision for pedestrians and cyclists proposed as part of the scheme. These included:
- 55 opposed shared space for pedestrians and cyclists
41 were concerned with pedestrian and cyclist conflicts resulting from shared space
40 said that shared use space was inappropriate for cyclists and pedestrians, including bus stop passengers
4 supported the use of shared space for pedestrians and cyclists

Demand and cost
59 (13%) respondents commented about demand for cycle facilities. These included:
- 24 said that the route would encourage cycling
- 21 stated that they felt that the proposals are a waste of money, or that the money could be spent elsewhere
- 7 thought that cycle infrastructure is not used sufficiently by cyclists
- 3 said that cycle demand was only at peak times

Routing, alignment and connections
There were 42 (9%) respondents who made a comment suggesting alternative routes for the Cycle Superhighway. These included:
- 25 called for increased or improved connections to the proposed route
- 16 suggested cyclists should take other routes or included a suggestion for an alternative route for the cycle track
- 6 said the route should go via Holland Park / Uxbridge Road
- 5 suggested the route should follow quieter roads
- 3 said the route should be extended further West along the A40

Support/opposition
152 (34%) respondents made comments supporting or opposing the scheme. These included:
- 114 made a supportive comment about the scheme, including 8 (2%) who said that the scheme should be built quickly
- 34 made a negative comment about the scheme
- 5 supported the London Cycle Campaign comments about the scheme

Traffic and congestion
There were 73 (16%) respondents who commented about traffic and congestion. These included:
- 45 were concerned that the proposals would increase traffic congestion
- 22 suggested that proposals would increase journey times for motor traffic
- 15 pointed to the current congestion levels in the scheme area or generally
- 14 said that previous Cycle Superhighway schemes had caused congestion or increased journey times
- 9 opposed the scheme citing the traffic impacts of previous cycling schemes
• 7 felt that proposals will decrease traffic congestion, including 2 (<1%) who called for motor traffic to be reduced
• 4 were concerned about motor traffic speeds

Traffic lanes
There were 55 (12%) respondents who commented about traffic lanes or the carriageway:

Adding or removing traffic lanes
• 40 opposed the removal of traffic lanes or carriageway
• 22 supported the removal of traffic lanes or carriageway
• 2 commented about the width of traffic lanes
• 2 supported adding traffic lanes or carriageway

Environment and health
51 (11%) respondents commented about the environmental and health impacts of the scheme. These included:

Air pollution
• 15 said that thought the proposals would increase air pollution, including 1 concerned about current air pollution levels
• 14 felt that proposals would expose cyclists to increased pollution
• 10 felt the proposals would decrease air pollution

Health
• 11 felt that the proposals would lead to positive health impacts
• 5 felt that proposals would lead to negative health impacts

Environment and construction
• 10 felt that proposals would improve the environment or made suggestions of ways to improve the environment
• 2 were concerned about the potential impact construction traffic may have on the local environment

Noise pollution
• 5 said that the proposals would increase noise pollution

Road users
28 (6%) respondents made a comment about the impacts on road users other than motorists. These included:
• 10 said that bus users had not been considered, including 2 (x%) who said that electric vehicles should be used and 1 (<1%) who was concerned about the position of the bus layby
• 5 felt that coach users will not benefit
• 5 felt that taxis and private high vehicles will not benefit
• 3 ( thought that proposals will be beneficial to all road users
• 3 (1%) were concerned about the potential impact on emergency services
• 2 (<1%) felt the scheme would not benefit pedestrians

Elevated Westway section
18 (4%) respondents made a comment about the elevated Westway section. These comments are outside the scope of the proposed Cycle Superhighway between Wood Lane and Acton.

Social and economic impacts
17 (4%) respondents commented about the social and economic impacts of the scheme. These included:
- 11 were concerned about the impact on business and the economy
- 7 raised a concern about wider social impacts
- 4 were concerned about the impact on deliveries and servicing
- 3 raised a comment in regards to the potential impact on Westfield, including access and usage

Cyclist behaviour
13 (3%) respondents commented about cyclist behaviour. These included:
- 10 were concerned with the cyclists’ behaviour and suggested enforcement, education and other measures
- 3 suggested that proposals should not provide for cyclists as they do not pay road tax or insurance
- 2 believed that the proposals would decrease noise pollution

Consultation and data
11 (2%) respondents suggested alternative routes for the Cycle Superhighway. These included:
- 7 felt that that the results of the consultation will be ignored
- 4 argued that traffic modelling and the data from which the proposals are based are inaccurate or require more detail
Question 4 Do you have any comments about our proposals for Wood Lane to Bloemfontein Road?

Of the 445 total respondents, 76 (17%) left comments for this question.

Support/opposition
50 (11%) respondents made a comment expressing support or opposition. These included:
- 30 made a general negative comment
- 20 gave a general positive comment

Cycle facilities
53 (11%) of respondents made a comment about the proposed cycle facilities. Themes arising included:

Shared space and segregation
33 (7%) of respondents made a comment about shared space and segregation. Comments included:
- 20 supported segregation or space for cycling, including 1 respondent who suggested that a barrier was needed
- 16 suggested that more cycling provision or space for cycling needs to be provided
- 16 opposed the shared use space for pedestrians and cyclists proposed as part of the scheme and 1 supported it
- 4 said that cyclists needed more protection

Level of provision
29 (7%) respondents made a comment about the level of provision proposed as part of the scheme. Comments included:
- 7 suggested that proposals are inadequate to be called a Cycle Superhighway – including failure to meet TfL design specifications
- 6 believed that this section should be redesigned or should offer better facilities for cycling
- 6 made a comment about demand for the proposals with 3 saying that the scheme represented overprovision for cycling, 2 saying it was needed to meet cycling demand and 1 commenting about pedestrian numbers.
- 6 said that it would improve the experience for cyclists in the area, which 1 said that it would not
- 6 said that the cycle lane should be continuous
- 4 made a comment about side streets, including 1 who suggested improved signage at side streets
4 made a comment about the closure of the subway or footbridge, include 1 suggesting signage at the subway

Routing, alignment and access
19 (4%) of respondents made a comment about the proposed routing of the cycle track and access to the cycle track. Comments included:

- 8 supported the improved connectivity with other cycle routes, including
  - 2 who suggested improving provision at Wood Lane
- 6 said that the cycle lane should be continuous
- 6 said that a route should be provided on the carriageway
- 2 believed the route should be extended to Uxbridge
- 1 felt that quieter roads should be used for cycle superhighway

Cycle track
6 (1%) of respondents made suggestions about the cycle facilities proposed as part of the scheme. Comments included:

- 4 were concerned about the width of the cycle lane
- 1 supported the proposed width
- 1 suggested that cycle parking should be provided on the route

Motor traffic
19 (4%) of respondents made a comment about the provision for motor vehicles and traffic impacts. Comments included:

Traffic impacts
- 12 felt that the proposals would increase congestion or journey times for motor traffic
- 1 were concerned on the impact on emergency services
- 1 was concerned about current congestion

Traffic lanes and parking
- 3 opposed the loss of carriageway for traffic
- 3 supported the loss of carriageway from traffic
- 2 opposed loss of parking

Cycle safety and behaviour
18 (4%) of respondents made a comment about cyclist behaviour or safety. Comments included:

- 10 were concerned that cyclists would conflict with pedestrians or other road users
- 7 felt that the proposals would improve safety for cyclists, while 1 believed that it would not improve safety
- 2 were concerned about cyclist behaviour
- 1 was concerned about cyclist conflict with motorists
Environment and health
8 (2%) respondents made a comment about the environmental and health provisions. Comments included:

- 5 felt that proposals would increase air pollution
- 1 suggested that these proposals would bring a positive health benefit
- 1 suggested that these proposals would negatively impact health
- 1 felt that proposals needed to make more improvements to the environment

Other
8 (2%) of respondents made a comment about a different topic. Comments included:

- 7 felt that proposals were a waste of money and 1 was concerned about the wider economic impact
- 2 suggested that the consultation was biased
Question 6: Do you have any comments on our proposals for Bloemfontein Road to Hemlock Road?

Of the 445 total respondents, 68 (15%) left a comment for this question.

Support/opposition
45 (10%) of respondents made a comment expressing support or opposition. These included:

- 29 made a generally negative comment or opposed the proposals for this section
- 16 made a generally positive comment or were supportive of proposals for this section

Cycle facilities
40 (9%) of respondents made a comment about the proposed cycle facilities. Themes arising included:

Shared space and segregation
25 (6%) respondents made a comment about shared space and segregation. Comments included:

- 19 made a comment about shared use space including 18 who opposed it with 1 respondent particularly concerned about shared use space at Sundew Avenue, however 1 supported it
- 18 supported segregation or space for cycling
- 13 suggested that more cycling provision or space for cycling needs to be provided

Cycle track
20 (4%) respondents made suggestions about the cycle track proposed. Comments included:

- 9 were concerned about the width of the cycle lane
- 7 respondents made a suggestion about the cycle track at side roads, including a barrier or dropped kerbs at Sundew Avenue, a raised table and more space for cycling at Lavender court, and improvements at Bentworth Road and Heathstan Road
- 5 suggested that cyclists should have priority at Bloemfontein Road, including 3 who said this would improve safety
- 5 were concerned about obstructions on the shared use path
- 1 said that a pedestrian guard rail was needed

Level of provision
14 (3%) respondents made a comment about the level of provision proposed as part of the scheme. Comments included:
• 11 called for a redesign of this section or for facilities to be improved
• 2 felt that proposals would not improve the experience of cyclists
• 2 felt that proposals are inadequate to be called a Cycle Superhighway and did not meet TfL design guidelines
• 2 believed that that was insufficient demand for cycling to justify the route
• 1 suggested cycle parking on the route
• 1 said that the route will encourage cycling

Routing, alignment and access
10 (2%) of respondents made a comment about the proposed routing of the cycle track and access to the cycle track. Comments included:

• 5 suggested that the cycle lane should be provided on the carriageway
• 3 thought that the cycle lane should have improved connectivity
• 2 suggested the route should be extended to Uxbridge along the A40
• 1 thought that quieter roads should be used for cycle superhighway

Road layout and traffic
15 (3%) respondents made a comment about the impact on road layout and traffic. Comments included:

Traffic impacts
• 11 felt that the proposals would increase congestion or journey times
• 1 thought congestion would be reduced by the proposals
• 1 were concerned about the impact on hospital emergency services

Road layout
• 5 opposed the loss of carriageway for traffic
• 2 opposed loss of parking
• 1 supported the loss of carriageway for traffic

Environment and health
9 (2%) respondents made a comment about environment or health. Comments included:

• 4 opposed the loss of trees or green space, or suggested more planting
• 3 felt that proposals would increase air pollution, while 1 said the proposals would decrease air pollution
• 2 suggested that these proposals would negatively impact health

Cycle safety and behaviour
8 (2%) of respondents made a comment about cyclist safety and behaviour. Comments included:

• 13 were concerned that cyclists will conflict with other road users, including 10 who were concerned about pedestrian / cyclist conflicts and 3 who were concerned about pedestrian motorist conflicts
• 4 said that the proposals provide a greater sense of safety for cyclists
• 4 suggested that better signage and protection for cyclists was needed

Other
• 5 felt that proposals were a waste of money with 1 concerned about the wider economic impact
Question 8: Do you have any comments on our proposals for Hemlock Road to Savoy Circus?

Of the 445 respondents, 73 (16%) left a comment for Question 8 “Do you have any comments about our proposals for Westway (Hemlock Road to Savoy Circus)?”

Support/opposition
54 (12%) respondents made a comment expressing support or opposition. These included:

- 35 made a generally negative comment or opposed the proposals in this section
- 19 made a generally positive comment or supported the proposals in this section

Cycle facilities
38 (9%) respondents made a comment about the proposed cycle facilities. Themes arising included:

Shared space and segregation
27 (6%) respondents made a comment about shared space and segregation. Comments included:

- 16 opposed shared use space for pedestrians and cyclists and 1 supported it
- 16 supported segregation or space for cycling
- 10 suggested that more cycling provision or space for cycling needs to be provided

Level of provision
23 (5%) respondents made a comment about the level of provision proposed as part of the scheme. Comments included:

- 8 suggested that this section should be redesigned or that facilities should be improved
- 6 said that the proposals would improve the experience for cyclists
- 4 said that pedestrian provision should be improved
- 2 felt that proposals are inadequate to be called a Cycle Superhighway and did not meet TfL design guidelines
- 2 made a comment about the design for Savoy Circus, including concerns about safety and congestion
- 2 suggested improvements at Banstead Road, including improved signage and dropped kerbs for cyclists

Cycle track / shared use path
18 (4%) respondents made suggestions about the cycle track. Comments included:

- 8 mentioned the width of the cycle lane, with 6 voicing concern and 1 concerned about the cycle lane width at the Hemlock Road subway
• 4 felt this section should be redesigned, including 2 who called for improvements to the Hilary Road junction
• 3 were concerned about obstructions such as lamp columns and trees in the shared use path
• 1 said that the cycle track should be continuous

Routing, alignment and access
8 (2%) respondents made a comment about the proposed routing of the cycle track or access. Comments included:

• 4 felt that the cycle lane should have improved connectivity
• 2 suggested that a route should be provided on the carriageway
• 2 suggested the route should be extended to Uxbridge A40
• 1 felt that quieter roads should be used for cycle superhighway

Traffic and parking
23 (5%) respondents made a comment about the impact on road layout and traffic. Comments included:

Traffic impacts
• 15 felt that the proposals would increase congestion or journey times
• 1 said that the proposals would reduce congestion
• 1 were concerned on the impact on emergency services

Road layout
• 5 supported the loss of carriageway
• 2 opposed the loss of parking proposed
• 1 supported the loss of parking proposed
• 1 opposed the loss of carriageway

Cycle safety and behaviour
17 (4%) respondents made a comment about benefits for cycling. Comments included:

• 9 were concerned about conflicts between cyclists and other road users, including 8 who were concerned about conflicts with pedestrians and 1 concerned about conflicts with motorists
• 4 felt that proposals provide a greater sense of safety for cyclists
• 1 thought proposals were unfair as cyclists do not pay road tax

Environment and health
9 (2%) respondents made a comment about environment or health. Comments included:

• 4 felt that proposals need more green space or opposed the loss of green space
• 3 felt that proposals will increase air pollution
• 2 felt that proposals will reduce air pollution
1 suggested that these proposals will negatively impact health

Other
7 (2%) respondents made a different comment, which included:

- 6 felt that proposals were a waste of money and 1 was concerned about the wider economic impact
- 2 made a comment about the consultation, included that the consultation was biased or the results would not be listened to
Question 10 Savoy Circus
Of the 445 respondents, 108 (24%) left a comment for Question 10 ‘Do you have any comments about our proposals for Savoy Circus?’ The comments are summarised below.

Support/opposition
63 (14%) respondents made a comment expressing support or opposition. These included:
- 40 made a generally negative comment or opposed the scheme
- 23 made a generally positive or supportive comment

Cycle facilities
58 (13%) of respondents made a comment about the proposed cycle facilities. Themes arising included:

Shared space and segregation
58 (9%) respondents made a comment about shared space and segregation. Comments included:
- 26 supported segregation or space for cycling
- 25 suggested that more cycling provision or space for cycling should be provided, including 1 (<1%) who suggested more space for cycling at Old Oak Common
- 15 opposed the shared use space for pedestrians and cyclists proposed in the scheme

Level of provision
42 (9%) respondents made a comment about the level of provision proposed as part of the scheme. Comments included:
- 24 thought this section should be redesigned or improved facilities should be provided
- 18 said that they would like to see more done at Savoy Circus, including 2 who thought that the design was too complex, 1 who suggested building an underpass at Savoy Circus and 1 who was concerned about pedestrian congestion
- 7 felt that proposals are inadequate to be called a Cycle Superhighway – including failure to meet TfL design specifications
- 6 said that the proposals would encourage cycling or improve the experience of cycling in the area, and 2 said it would discourage cycling
- 3 mentioned demand for the scheme, with 1 person saying that the facilities would not meet demand, 1 commenting that cyclist demand did not justify the route and 1 concerned over pedestrian numbers
- 2 said that priority should be given to cyclists at side roads
- 2 were concerned over removing the pedestrian guard rail
- 1 person was concerned about maintenance of the cycle track
Cycle track
28 (6%) respondents made suggestions about the cycle facilities. Comments included:

- 12 were concerned that about the proposed shared cycle pedestrian crossing, including 9 (2%) who were concerned that the crossing was too indirect or slow for cyclists and 6 (1%) who raised concerns for pedestrians using the crossing, including wait times and pedestrian / cyclist conflicts
- 8 were concerned about the width of the cycle lane
- 1 was concerned about obstructions in the shared use path
- 1 was concerned about the cycle track being continuous
- 1 was worried about the closure of the subway

Routing, alignment and access
15 (3%) respondents made a comment about the proposed routing of the cycle track or access. Comments included:

- 13 said that cycle connectivity should be improved in the area
- 2 wanted the route extended to Uxbridge along the A40
- 2 suggested that the cycle route was provided along the carriageway
- 1 felt that quieter roads should be used for cycle superhighway

Cyclist safety and behaviour
27 (6%) respondents made a comment about cyclist safety. Comments included:

- 13 were concerned about conflict between cyclists and pedestrians
- 6 suggested there should be more protection for cyclists
- 5 believed that proposals would improve safety for cyclists
- 4 concerned about pedestrian / motorist conflicts

Traffic and parking
23 (5%) respondents made a comment about the impact on road layout and traffic. Comments included:

- 13 felt that the proposals would increase congestion or increase journey times
- 7 opposed and 5 (1%) supported removing a traffic lane or carriageway
- 4 were concerned
- 1 was concerned about whether larger vehicles could be accommodated
- 1 was concerned on the impact on emergency services
- 1 was concerned about increased bus journey times

Environment and health
7 (2%) respondents made a comment about environment or health. Comments included:

- 3 suggested more tree planting or green space or opposed the loss of green space
- 3 thought that the proposals would increase air pollution
- 1 suggested that the proposals would negatively impact health
• 1 thought proposals would improve health

**Other**

7 (2%) respondents made a comment about another topic. Comments included:

• 4 felt that proposals were a waste of money
• 2 were concerned about the positioning of bus stops
• 1 believed the consultation was biased
Question 12 Savoy Circus to Perryn Road
Of the 445 respondents, 67 (15%) left comments in the open text field for Question 12 “Do you have any comments about our proposals for Savoy Circus to Perryn Road?”

**Cycle and pedestrian facilities**
41 (9%) respondents made a comment about the proposed cycle facilities. Themes arising included:

*Level of provision*
27 (6%) respondents made a comment about the level of provision proposed as part of the scheme. Comments included:

- 9 highlighted issues at side roads, with 7 saying that cyclists needed more priority at side roads, and 1 saying that better signage was needed and 1 suggesting dropped kerbs should be provided at side roads
- 7 called for this section to be redesigned, with 1 respondent calling for a design to address congestion at Horn Lane and 1 wanting a different design at Wales Farm Road
- 5 made a comment that the crossings proposed in this section were indirect and slow for pedestrians and cyclists, including 1 suggestion to improve the crossing at Leamington Park
- 3 found that proposals would make cycling more attractive or encourage cyclists
- 3 said that the proposals were insufficient to be called a Cycle Superhighway
- 3 said that the scheme was overprovision for cyclists
- 1 said that proposals would not meet demand

*Shared space and segregation*
24 (5%) respondents made a comment about shared space and segregation. Comments included:

- 17 supported segregation
- 15 suggested that better cycling provision or more space for cycling should be provided
- 6 opposed shared use space for cycling and pedestrians

*Routing, alignment and access*
14 (3%) respondents made a comment about the proposed routing of the cycle track or access. Comments included:
11 suggested that cycle route connectivity should be improved, including 1 suggestion to upgrade the paths around North Acton station

1 suggested the route should be extended to Uxbridge via the A40

**Cycle track**

9 (2%) respondents made suggestions about the cycle track. Comments included:

- 6 (1%) were concerned about the width of the cycle lane
- 3 (1%) said that the cycle track should be continuous
- 1 (<1%) was concerned about obstructions in the shared use path
- 1 (<1%) was concerned about the cycle track being continuous
- 1 (<1%) said that quieter roads should be used for the cycle track

**Support/opposition**

40 (9%) respondents made a comment expressing support or opposition. These included:

- 22 made a generally negative comment
- 18 made a generally positive comment

**Traffic and parking**

26 (6%) respondents made a comment about the impact on road layout and traffic. Comments included:

- 14 felt that the proposals will increase congestion or increase journey times
- 5 opposed the loss of carriageway for motor traffic
- 2 supported the removal of a traffic lane
- 1 were concerned on the impact on emergency services
- 1 suggested traffic signals at Leamington Park

**Cycle safety and behaviour**

8 (2%) respondents made a comment about cyclist safety. Comments included:

- 4 said that the proposals would improve safety for cyclists
- 4 were concerned with pedestrian and cycle conflicts
- 2 were concerned about pedestrian / motorist conflicts
- 1 said that the proposals would not improve safety

**Environment and health**

8 (2%) of respondents made a comment about environment or health. Comments included:

- 4 felt that proposals would increase air pollution
- 3 felt that proposals need more green space or opposed the loss of green space
- 1 believed the proposals would have a negative health impact
- 1 was concerned about noise pollution and suggested an acoustic barrier was needed
Other

- 6 respondents felt that proposals were a waste of money and 1 was concerned about the wider economic impact
- 2 opposed the removal of bus stops
Question 14 Western Avenue (Perryn Road to Gypsy Corner)
Of the 445 respondents, 67 (15%) left comments in the open text field for Question 14.

Support/opposition
50 (11%) respondents made a comment expressing support or opposition. These included:
  • 27 made a generally positive comment
  • 23 made a generally negative comment

Cycle facilities
10% respondents made a comment about the proposed cycle facilities. Themes arising included:

Level of provision
33 (7%) respondents made a comment about the level of provision proposed as part of the scheme. Comments included:
  • 11 felt that this section needs to be redesigned, including 1 who suggested upgrading other cycle paths
  • 12 made a comment about side roads, including 3 who suggested redesigning the Allan Way crossing or subway and 2 who suggested filtering traffic at some side roads
  • 9 suggested that priority is required for cyclists at side roads
  • 7 made a comment about demand, with 4 saying it wouldn’t meet demand, 2 saying it wasn’t needed and 1 saying that pedestrian demand was greater than demand for cycling
  • 5 said that the proposals would not improve the experience of cycling
  • 4 said that proposals would make cycling more pleasant or attractive
  • 3 said that the junction was too slow or indirect for cyclists
  • 2 felt that proposals are inadequate to be called a Cycle Superhighway – including failure to meet TfL design specifications
  • 3 suggested improving pedestrian facilities, including 1 who called for improved access to the tube station
  • 1 suggested improved signage at side roads
  • 1 made a comment about the design at Gypsy Corner
  • 1 suggested adding cycle parking as part of the scheme
  • 1 suggested an acoustic barrier on the cycle track

Shared space and segregation
30 (7%) respondents made a comment about shared space and segregation. Comments included:
  • 18 suggested that more cycling provision or space for cycling should be provided as current provision was inadequate
  • 13 supported segregation or space for cycling
• 6 opposed shared used space for pedestrians and cyclists
• 4 called for more protection or segregation for cyclists specifically at crossings, including 1 who called for additional provision at Horn Lane
• 2 supported shared use space for pedestrians and cyclists

Routing, alignment and access
19 (4%) respondents made a comment about the proposed routing of the cycle track or access. Comments included:

• 12 suggested that cycle route connectivity should be improved, including 3 who suggested improving links to Acton and Acton stations
• 6 highlighted that access from Horn Lane could be difficult, including 4 who suggested alternative facilities at Horn Lane such as another crossing east of Horn Lane and a more direct or quicker crossing
• 2 suggested the route should be extended to Uxbridge along the A40
• 1 felt that quieter roads should be used for cycle superhighway
• 1 suggested extending the cycle track to Park Royal or Hangar Lane

Cycle track
13 (3%) respondents made suggestions about the cycle facilities. Comments included:

• 11 said that the cycle track should be continuous
• 3 were concerned with obstructions in the shared use path
• 1 were concerned about the width of the cycle lane

Traffic
18 (4%) respondents made a comment about the impact on motor traffic. Comments included:

• 13 said that the proposals would increase congestion or journey times
• 4 opposed the loss of carriageway
• 1 said that the proposals would decrease congestion
• 1 were concerned on the impact on emergency services
• 1 was concerned about current congestion

Environment and health
17 (4%) respondents made a comment about environment or health. Comments included:

• 6 felt that proposals would increase air pollution
• 3 suggested that these proposals would negatively impact health
• 2 said the proposals would decrease air pollution
• 1 felt that proposals needed more green space or opposed the loss of green space
Cyclist safety and behaviour
16 (4%) respondents made a comment about cyclist safety or behaviour. Comments included:

- 9 were concerned with cyclist conflicts with other road users, including 6 who concerned about cyclist conflicts with motorists and 3 who raised concerns about cyclist conflicts with pedestrians
- 4 said that the proposals would improve safety for cyclists and 1 said that the proposals would not improve cyclist safety
- 3 was concerned with cyclist behaviour

Other
- 6 felt that proposals were a waste of money
- 1 was concerned about the wider economic impact
- 1 made a comment about the consultation, saying that it was designed to prevent people having a say
Question 16 Gypsy Corner to Kathleen Avenue
Of the 445 respondents, 76 (17%) left comments in the open text field for Question 16.

Support/opposition
54 (12%) of respondents made a comment expressing support or opposition. These included:
- 28 made a generally negative comment
- 25 made a generally positive comment

Pedestrian and cycling facilities
48 (11%) respondents made a comment about the proposed cycle and pedestrian facilities. Themes arising included:

Level of provision
39 (9%) of respondents made a comment about the level of provision proposed as part of the scheme. Comments included:
- 11 suggested improving crossings for pedestrians or cyclists, including 6 suggestions to improve Horn Lane with additional facilities, 1 suggestion to add a footbridge from Portal Way to Leamington Park and 1 suggestion to improve the Allan Way subway
- 10 made a comment about demand, with 7 saying that the scheme was not justified by the demand for cycling, and 3 saying that the scheme would not meet the demand for cycling
- 9 made a comment about the provision at side roads, including 2 who suggested closing some side roads to motor traffic
- 8 said that the scheme needed to be redesigned or that improvements needed to be made to the proposals
- 6 said that priority for cyclists was needed at side roads
- 3 called for more protection or segregation for cyclists, specifically at crossings or junctions
- 3 said that the proposals would discourage cycling
- 3 commented that the proposals were insufficient to be called a Cycle Superhighway
- 3 said that the proposals would improve the experience or encourage cycling
- 2 (suggested cycle parking along the route
- 1 said that the proposals would not improve the experience of cycling
- 1 said that cycling should be given more priority in general

Shared space and segregation
31 (7%) of respondents made a comment about shared space and segregation. Comments included:
- 17 supported segregated cycling facilities
- 10 suggested that more cycling provision or space for cycling should be provided as current provision was inadequate
• 9 opposed shared use space and 1 supported it opposed shared use
• 4 said that more protection was required for cyclists

**Cycle track**
21 (5%) respondents made suggestions about the cycle facilities. Comments included:

• 9 said that the cycle track should be continuous
• 8 were concerned with obstructions in shared use paths
• 4 made a comment about the width of the cycle track, with 3 saying that it would be too narrow and 1 approving of the width
• 2 were concerned with the maintenance of the cycle track
• 2 were concerned about signage on the cycle track or suggested more signage
• 1 felt that proposals are inadequate to be called a cycle superhighway – including failure to meet TfL design specifications

**Routing, alignment and access**
14 (3%) respondents made a comment about the proposed routing of the cycle track or access. Comments included:

• 8 suggested that cycle route connectivity should be improved
• 2 said that routing through junctions route for cyclists was slow or indirect
• 3 commented about the route of the cycle track, with 2 opposing the current route and 1 said that quieter roads should be used
• 2 suggested a contraflow and crossing for cycles on Horn Lane
• 1 said that the route should be provided on the carriageway
• 1 suggested extending the cycle track

**Cyclist safety and behaviour**
24 (5%) of respondents made a comment about cyclist safety. Comments included:

• 12 raised a comment about safety, with 7 saying that proposals would improve safety for cyclists and 5 that proposals were not safe enough for cycling
• 11 were concerned about cycle / pedestrian conflicts
• 3 were concerned with pedestrian and cycle conflicts
• 3 was concerned with cyclist behaviour

**Traffic and parking**
19 (4%) respondents made a comment about the impact on road layout and traffic. Comments included:

• 14 felt that the proposals would increase congestion or journey times for motorists, while 1 (<1%) said the proposals would reduce congestion
• 6 opposed the loss of carriageway
• 2 suggested enforcing speed limits more
• 1 were concerned about the impact on emergency services
• 1 opposed the loss of carriageway for traffic
Pedestrian and bus user facilities
11 (2%) respondents made a comment about pedestrian and bus user facilities. Themes arising included:
- 10 said that improvements to pedestrian facilities were also needed, including 1 who wanted to see improved pedestrian facilities at Gypsy Corner
- 2 believed that these proposals did not address the needs of pedestrians
- 1 felt that bus users are neglected in these proposals

Environment and health
11 (2%) respondents were concerned about the environmental and health implications of the scheme. Comments included:
- 5 felt that proposals would increase air pollution and 1 said the proposals would decrease air pollution
- 2 commented that the proposals needed more green space or opposed the loss of green space

Other
- 7 said that proposals were a waste of money, and there was 1 concern about the wider economic impact
Appendix B: TfL response to issues commonly raised (overall proposals)

This appendix sets out our response to general issues raised in response to consultation. We aim to publish our response to issues raised about specific aspects of the design we consulted on later in 2017.

Shared-use and pedestrian facilities
We acknowledge the concerns raised by some respondents regarding the extent of the improvements to the shared-use path, the interaction between pedestrians and cyclists along the route, and the pedestrian crossing facilities at Savoy Circus. We continue to develop our plans for the route from Wood Lane to Acton, considering the needs of all users while minimising conflict.

Suitability of the A40 for a Cycle Superhighway
Some respondents called for cycle routes such as this 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. Upgrading the existing cycle route along the A40 to current standards for this type of route achieves this balance. 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.

Local connections
Some respondents suggested connections to existing cycle routes or the creation of new cycle routes leading from the A40.

The purpose of the scheme is to provide an east-west cycle route along the A40, and additional cycle routes leading from the A40 are not within the scope of this scheme. Where possible, connections for cyclists onto borough roads (such as dropped kerbs or extending the shared path) have been proposed to enable connections to future cycle routes.

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 2000.¹

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.

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

¹ 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.
• 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

Environment
Some respondents felt that the proposals would create a better environment for local residents and cyclists, and would lead to less air and noise pollution. Others felt the scheme would increase pollution and commented on the health impacts for cyclists riding alongside the A40.

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.

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.
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 suggested this would be the case with these proposals as well.

While construction would cause some unavoidable disruption to journeys in the area, we will be able to minimise the impact as the bulk of construction would be upgrading the existing off-carriageway facilities.

Consultation results will not be taken into account
All consultation responses were added to our consultation hub and analysed to give the quantitative and qualitative results in this report. Additionally, all comments submitted as part of the consultation were read by the consultation team and summarised for consideration by the project team. The results of the consultation were used to inform our decision making process and any new issues or suggestions were considered as part of the design.

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 on our consultation website.

Validity of traffic modelling
Some respondents questioned the validity of our traffic modelling predictions, which we presented as part of the information explaining our 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 we will 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.
Appendix C: Consultation letters

Transport for London

Transport for London
Consultation Team
10 G4, Palestra
197 Blackfriars Road
London
SE1 8NJ

0343 222 1155
consultations@tfl.gov.uk

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 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

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

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

MAYOR OF LONDON
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
\texttt{tfl.gov.uk/east-west-consult} on the day of the event before travelling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>North Acton Pavilion, North Acton Playing Fields, Noel Road, Acton, W3 0JF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Saturday 20 February, 1000-1400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>White City Community Centre, India Way, White City, W12 7QT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Friday 26 February, 1600-2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>St Dunstan’s Church, Friars Place Lane, Acton, W3 7AW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Tuesday 08 March, 1300-1700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

[Signature]

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

Supported the proposals

The Council was disappointed that proposals gave little or no consideration to connecting the superhighway with Brent’s local cycle network at key junctions. It also wants the Wood Lane junction to be redesigned and for a fresh consultation to be held on this section of the route.

For the Savoy Circus section the council noted that north-south movement had not been addressed, and the growing residential areas around East Acton station, Old Oak Common and Park Royal needed a safe, direct and convenient link to the superhighway.

Also while the Gypsy Corner gyratory offers key links to local transport hubs and residential areas, pedestrian crossing facilities are unchanged and cyclists will need better provision to access the new infrastructure safely and conveniently.

The council said that the proposals do not address the fact that the A40 is a major barrier to cycling in West London. As a result some local communities will be less likely to use the superhighway. Better connections are needed to local networks to change travel behaviour and encourage more people to cycle.
London Borough of Ealing

Supported the proposals

The Council said pinch-points on the route need to be eliminated - by narrowing carriageway lanes or purchasing adjacent land. It also noted that shared pathway width at bus stops should be at least 4 metres – with cyclists guided to ride at least a metre from bus doors – to prevent obstruction.

With regard to the A40, it stressed the need to create distance between cyclists and motor vehicles and have a solid acoustic/pollution barrier wherever possible to mitigate the effects of noise, pollution and spray. It also noted that reducing side roads connecting to the A40 would also benefit cyclists (fewer junctions).

For the section between Wood Lane and Bloemfontein Road, the Council noted that lower cycling speeds mean slip road length could be reduced. It also commented that shared footway sections were not wide enough at bus stops and cycle tracks were frequently too narrow to permit two-way cycling.

The Council made similar comments about the section from Bloemfontein Road to Hemlock Road – also noting the lack of a cycle track on the A40 north side to link to the Heathstan Road toucan crossing. Between Hemlock Road and Savoy Circus it commented on the need for step-free connections to and from Hilary Road.

The Council opposes extra carriageway lanes around Savoy Circus and in the section from Savoy Circus to Perryn Road. It noted that they create a major pinch-point for pedestrians and cyclists at Old Oak Common Lane. It also commented that bus stop relocations in this area not only make interchange worse for passengers but are also in places where they compromise shared footway width.

It commented that Glendun Road Crossing should be a toucan and that step-free cycle access was needed to/from the centre of the carriageway of Foster Road, Gibbon Road, and Glendun Road.

From Perryn Road to Gypsy Corner the Council proposed making Rosebank Way cyclist only. It noted that cycle access to and from York Road needs improvement and suggested that the A40 crossing east of Wales Farm Road needs to be a toucan.

In the section between Gypsy Corner and Kathleen Avenue the Council wanted cyclists to have priority at side roads. It noted that the new toucan crossing of A40 at Horn Lane needs to be an integral part of CS route. It also suggested allowing cyclists to use service roads in front of proposed developments between Horn Lane and Kathleen Avenue – a shorter route with respite from traffic noise.
London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham  
*Supported the proposals*

The Council identified several areas it felt needed to be addressed.

For the section from Wood Lane to Bloemfontein Road it commented on a lack of visible access points to the superhighway for cyclists and pedestrians from local estates and said the subway exit/entrance needed to be more clearly identified.

The Council also noted concerns about how the new bus stop will interact with cycle flow and raised concerns about the impact of losing resident parking spaces.

It expressed the same concerns about parking spaces and identifying subway exits/entrances in the section from Bloemfontein Road to Hemlock Road. It also noted that the central section in a two-stage crossing at Bentworth Road wasn’t wide enough for cycles.

### 4.21.2 Emergency services

**London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA)**  
*No opinion on the proposals*

LFB is broadly supportive of schemes to encourage more sustainable forms of transport (including cycling). However, they are concerned that any increase in congestion might compromise their ability respond quickly to incidents.

### 4.21.3 Accessibility groups

**Wheels for Wellbeing**  
*Supported the proposals* (No overall or specific comments)

### 4.21.4 Transport organisations

**Confederation of Passenger Transport UK (CPT)**  
*Did not support the proposals*

CPT commented that the proposals will mean significant added journey times and have a major impact on express coach services using the A40 Westway for commuting and tourism. It questioned the wisdom of implementing additional cycling schemes until the effects of current ones have been analysed. It also suggested that the revised road layout at Savoy Circus would restrict larger vehicles’ (i.e. 15m
coaches) ability to turn.

**London Travel Watch**

*Partially support the proposals*

The organisation noted that use of bus lay-bys was an issue for passengers – buses can become trapped (and delayed) by other traffic. It also noted that side roads along the route are risky places for cyclists as motor vehicles cross their path. It suggested that entry treatment for side roads should be as steep and as inset from the main road as possible.

**The Oxford Tube**

*Supported the proposals*

The company said it was satisfied with the proposals for this section of the superhighway. It described the use of existing footpath facilities as sensible and noted that the scheme looks to improve junctions for all road users, not just cyclists.

### 4.21.5 Cycling organisations

**Brent Cyclists (London Cycling Campaign)**

*Did not support proposals*

The group commented that a Superhighway should have spaces dedicated to cycling not shared footway with pedestrians - at some points only 2.4m wide. It said current proposals would not support growth in cycling in the area.

At Savoy Circus it noted that cyclists and pedestrians should not be sharing space on crossings. It also suggested that Old Oak Common Lane and Old Oak Road should have dedicated cycling space and Old Oak Road become a no through road for motor vehicles.

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

*Supported the proposals*

The Group supports proposed new cycling superhighway routes including the route from Paddington to Acton. It noted that a larger proportion of students and staff would cycle in London if they felt comfortable and safe to do so, and supported the creation of segregated cycle paths.
Cycling Works  
*Supported the proposals*  
In the sections between Wood Lane and Savoy Circus the group noted that shared footway presents disadvantages for both pedestrians and cyclists with bus stops being major pinch points.

The group felt that the proposals for Savoy Circus were not an improvement – the junction is still bad for cyclists.

Between Savoy Circus and Perryn Road it suggested trimming space from the median and moving the bus stop at Carlisle Avenue to prevent cyclists and pedestrians obstructing each other.

In the section from Perryn Road to Gypsy Corner the group commented that cyclists should have priority where cycle tracks cross side roads and track markings should be clear and consistent so cars will give way. It also suggested there should be a clear separate route for cyclists across Leamington Park junction so they can cross in a single movement.

From Gypsy Corner to Kathleen Avenue, the group suggested that the A40 Horn Lane crossing should not have an island and allow both pedestrians and cyclists cross in a single movement across the traffic. It also wanted cyclist priority at Court Way and Allan Way.

Ealing Cycling Campaign  
*Supported the proposals*  

The group said that shared use of footway with pedestrians made proposals less attractive for cyclists looking for a traffic free route from Ealing to central London.

It argued that separation from traffic on the A40 - using solid screens wherever possible to provide protection and reduce noise and spray - would be crucial in persuading cyclists to use the route. The group suggested that reducing the number of side roads connecting to the A40 would also benefit cyclists by reducing junctions.

It asked that the new toucan crossing over the A40 at Horn Lane be included as an integral part of the route and noted the importance of subways as a means of connection - particularly at Allan Way.

The group stressed that the superhighway would not fulfil its potential without good connections not only to the existing Ealing borough cycle network but also with other major routes currently being studied, such as HS2 cycle route.
London Cycling Campaign (LCC)  
*Partially supported the proposals*

The LCC said that the current proposals offer limited benefits. It commented on the narrowness of the shared footway for cyclists and pedestrians and felt the route would benefit from better noise and spray screens, more cycling space and separate space for pedestrians. It also suggested using modal filters wherever possible along A40 side roads. The LCC would like to see all proposed schemes given a CLoS rating before they reach public consultation.

The group commented that pedestrian and cycle crossings are still awkward at Savoy Circus, extra lanes for vehicles mean that space for cycling/walking is lost.

Between Gypsy Corner and Kathleen Avenue the group suggested strategic modal filters on Allan Way and Court Way to ensure links to other Ealing routes and destinations are improved and also to link to the HS2 cycle route.

### 4.21.6 Businesses, business groups, employers and venues

**AgFe**
*Did not support the proposals*

The company commented that the route would add to the congestion that already creates problems for a workforce spending much of its day travelling around London. It means employees have to use the Underground (not a suitable space to conduct confidential business) thus losing significant working time. They felt the 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. It also said that the scheme was a waste of money.

**Phoebus Associates**  
*Supported the proposals*

The company commented that the proposals would provide a well integrated transport solution for West London - containing increased cycle traffic from Central London Cycle Superhighways and adding to the safety of all road users.
Stanhope Plc.

Did not support the proposals

The company noted there was no estimate on numbers of cyclists traveling east-west, now or in the future. It felt that lower vehicle capacity would lead to congestion and significant increases to journey times. It felt the forecast of decreased journey times of up to 10 mins westbound at PM peak was ‘counter-intuitive’ and that further traffic modelling is needed.

It also noted a lack of impact assessments for bus and pedestrian journeys, commenting that while complementary measures having beneficial impacts on journey times were mentioned they were not identified. Construction will also have adverse impacts for all road users - particularly on the Westway. While shared footway is welcome it is narrow in places and likely to cause issues for users.

Westfield Europe Limited (WEL)

No opinion on the proposals

WEL commented that proposals lack detailed analysis of their impact on travel times noting that additional congestion could have a considerable impact on customers.

They welcomed shared (pedestrian/cycle) footway on the south side of the A40 since this would take cyclists off the main carriageway. They proposed a physical test to provide evidence of changes to journey times. The company noted that the shared footway space between Wood Lane and Bloemfontein Road could cause conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians at narrow points and at bus stops.

4.21.7 Local interest groups

East Acton Golf Links Residents’ Association

Supported the proposals

The group suggested that the cycle route on Wood Lane between the new superhighway and the existing Wormwood Scrubs cycle path should be upgraded.

It also noted that clearer pedestrian signalling and “countdown” timers for crossings at Savoy Circus would mean pedestrians can cross both carriageways at once.

The group commented that the street scene and environment between Savoy Circus and Perryn Road needed to improve to attract cyclists. Cyclists travelling westbound (and uphill) along the A40 will be particularly affected by air and noise pollution. Additional tree and hedge plantings would counter this for cyclists and for local
residents. The group also felt better lighting may be required to make the superhighway safe and pleasant to use at night.

**Paddington Residents’ Active Concern on Transport (PRACT)**
*Did not express an opinion*