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Executive summary

This document explains the processes and responses of the consultation on the North-South Cycle Superhighway (CS6) between Stonecutter Street and King’s Cross.

Between 8 February 2016 and 20 March 2016, in partnership with Camden and Islington Councils, we consulted on detailed proposals for changes between Stonecutter Street and King’s Cross to complete the North-South Cycle Superhighway (CS6), which currently runs between Elephant & Castle and Stonecutter Street. In the earlier consultation for the first phase of the route¹ we consulted on the alignment of the second phase, but not the detail.

About the consultation

We sent 80,000 leaflets to properties within roughly a half mile radius of the proposed route for CS6 - similar to the distribution area for the consultation on the first phase of the route when we proposed the phase 2 alignment.

Besides the leaflets through people’s doors, we also targeted social media advertising in the area, advertised the consultation in journals such as for the taxi trade and print publications including the TFL page in The Metro, the Knowledge Quarter and local newsletters.

There was also news coverage in the Camden New Journal, Islington Tribune, Islington and Hackney Gazette, other local media and pan-London media including cycling media.

More than one million emails were sent to those who travel in the area using our customer database and we held local exhibitions at King’s Place, King’s Cross station and Farringdon station.

Responses to consultation

We received 1,391 responses to the consultation, with 53% fully supporting the proposals, rising to 70% including those who partially supported the proposals. 28% of respondents did not support the proposals while 3% said they were not sure or did not give an opinion.

We received over 60 responses from stakeholder groups including residents groups, local businesses and campaign

¹ We previously consulted on the North-South Cycle Superhighway between 3 September 2014 and 9 November 2014
organisations such as accessibility groups and cycle groups, representing a range of views about the proposals and specific parts of them. Groups who responded included the London Taxi Driver Association, London TravelWatch, Hatton Garden BID and Royal Mail. A response from Smithfield Market Tenants’ Association was backed-up by 24 individual businesses and 68 employees (see section 3.17 for more information).

Summary of issues raised by respondents

Below is a summary of the main issues raised during the consultation. For more detailed summaries, including issues raised by section, see the main report with our detailed analysis of responses.

Of the 1,391 people who responded to this consultation 652 (47%) provided a comment in the open text box. The most frequently raised issues related to the design of junctions, crossings and links, with respondents requesting changes or improvements. Some respondents also requested for the route to be longer, more direct or of higher quality, whilst others raised concerns about increased levels of congestion or pollution, or the safety of the scheme. Another key issue mentioned was the proposed alignment of the scheme along Judd Street. The Royal National Institute of Blind People (RNIB) headquarters are located on this street and some respondents were concerned that the proposals would make the area less accessible for visually impaired people. Some respondents felt the proposed route would be safer for cyclists and / or pedestrians than the existing situation.

Conclusion and next steps

The consultation on detailed proposals for the second phase of the North-South Cycle Superhighway has proved a valuable exercise which has brought our attention to a number of issues and concerns which we continue to investigate. It has also demonstrated a good level of support for the proposals. We are currently reviewing the consultation responses and scheme designs with key stakeholders and our partners in the consultation, Camden and Islington Councils. We also continue to discuss the proposals with those most affected by the proposed changes to junctions, crossings and road links.

We plan to publish our ‘Response to issues raised’ and announce how we will proceed in autumn 2016.
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1. Introduction

Cycling is now a major mode of transport in London. In 2014, 645,000 journeys a day were made by bike, a 10 per cent increase from 2013. Cycling during the morning rush hour in London has more than trebled since 2000 (TfL Cycle Census 2013). To achieve this growth, Transport for London (TfL) is planning a far-reaching programme of cycling provision to make the capital’s streets more attractive for cycling to more people, especially those groups currently under-represented among cyclists, including women, young people and older people.

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

1.2 Purpose of the scheme

The North-South Cycle Superhighway (CS6) has been designed to improve safety and reduce conflict between motor vehicles and cyclists, and to encourage the large numbers of people who would like to cycle, but currently feel unable to do so. Data from existing Cycle Superhighways suggests the new route would also draw cyclists away from other routes in central London which are less suitable for them.

We previously consulted on the North-South Cycle Superhighway in autumn 2014 and the first phase between Elephant & Castle and Stonecutter Street which opened in April. On the Blackfriars Bridge section of the route, cyclist numbers have increased by 55 per cent with cyclists now accounting for up to 70 per cent of traffic in peak periods.

This consultation sought to continue the substantially-segregated cycle route along main roads to Farringdon Road, and provide cycle improvements along quieter back streets towards King’s Cross. We would create space for the new cycle route by reallocating road space from other traffic and changing the operation of some junctions. Further details are available at tfl.gov.uk/cycle-north-south.

This report is the result of the consultation on the detailed proposals for the North-South Cycle Superhighway between the junction of Stonecutter Street/Farringdon Street and King’s Cross. The new section would link with the first section of this Superhighway going over Blackfriars Bridge to Elephant and Castle, making the full length of the substantially segregated cycle route five kilometres from end to end.

1.2.1 Overview of the proposals

Our proposals would continue the substantially-segregated cycle route along main roads to Farringdon Road, and provide cycle improvements along quieter back-streets towards King’s Cross.
The proposed route would start at Stonecutter Street, where the North-South Cycle Superhighway continues south to Elephant & Castle. It would continue north on Farringdon Road to Greville Street, connecting with the proposed Central London Grid at West Smithfield. At Greville Street, northbound cyclists would turn onto a quiet back-street route continuing to King’s Cross.

Southbound cyclists from King’s Cross would turn off the back-street route onto Farringdon Road at Ray Street via a new signalised junction and continue south on a stepped cycle track.

The quiet back-street route for northbound cyclists is proposed because Farringdon Road north of Greville Street is too narrow to accommodate segregated cycle tracks in both directions alongside facilities for other road users such as bus stops and loading bays for a number of shops and businesses.

The back-street route would connect with the Central London Grid on Calthorpe Street to Bloomsbury and Angel. There would also be connections with the proposed Central London Grid along Midland Road to Royal College Street, Camden Town and Swiss Cottage.

The proposed main road layout changes are below and at http://tfl.gov.uk/cycle-north-south.

1.2.2 Proposed main road layout changes

The new route would mean major changes to the road layout. Proposals for each section of the route are summarised below:

- Dedicated cycle lanes replacing sections of traffic and bus lane on Farringdon Road and Farringdon Street
- A quiet back-street route with improved cycle priority from Ray Street to King’s Cross
- Redesigned junctions, with improved priority for cyclists
- Links to other existing and proposed cycle routes, including the proposed Central London Grid at West Smithfield, Clerkenwell Road, Calthorpe Street, Tavistock Place, Judd Street and Midland Road
- New traffic restrictions to help traffic flow and create better conditions for cycling, including banned turns for motorists at Clerkenwell Road and Charterhouse Street
- Wider footways and public spaces, including at Calthorpe Street and Greville Street
- Seven new signalised pedestrian crossings, including all arms of Charterhouse Street junction and two new zebra crossings
- Changes to parking and loading, with some provision introduced, some removed, and some relocated or re-timed
• Changes to bus stops, including some new bypasses for cyclists

1.2.3 Traffic and bus impacts

We would not expect these proposals to noticeably increase journey times for other road users, and in some cases our modelling shows improvements. There would still be some increases in journey times overall on the route when compared to the existing situation before construction for other schemes commenced. This is because of the impact of other schemes nearby that were not part of this consultation.

Pedestrian wait times at existing signalised junctions would be proposed to remain the same, and wait times at Farringdon Station would be expected to reduce because of the closure of Greville Street to motor traffic. New signalised pedestrian crossings were proposed at Charterhouse Street, Ray Street and where Clerkenwell Road meets Saffron Hill and Herbal Hill.

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

1.2.4 Parking and loading

Although we have designed our proposals to minimise the impact on parking and loading, we would need to relocate or remove a small amount of existing kerbside parking and loading to make space for the cycle route. Some loading provision would also operate for less time.

1.2.5 Businesses, servicing and deliveries

We continue to work with businesses and freight operators to minimise the impact of these proposals on their operations.
1.3 Proposed route alignment

This map shows some of the main changes proposed along the route. For detailed proposals visit tfl.gov.uk/cycle-north-south.

Key:
- North-South Cycle Superhighway (CS6) under construction
- North-South Cycle Superhighway (CS6) Stonecutter Street - King's Cross
- London Underground station
- National Rail station
- Two-way cycle track
- With flow cycle track
- Cycle route on quiet roads

Connection with Central London Grid
Connection with Central London Grid
New two-way cycle track replaces traffic lane between Pakenham St and Phoenix Pl
New signalised junction at Ray St with pedestrian crossings on three arms
New signalised junction providing crossing over Clerkenwell Rd for cyclists
Northbound cyclists on quiet roads
Southbound cyclists in stepped track
Connection with Central London Grid
Greville St closed to motor traffic at Farrington Rd. New segregated cycle track links cyclists to Saffron Hill
New signalised pedestrian crossings on all arms of Charterhouse St junction
Connection with Central London Grid
Extent of King's Cross improvement scheme
Connection with Central London Grid (see separate consultation on Judd St/Midland Rd)
2. About the consultation

Consultation on the North-South Cycle Superhighway from Stonecutter Street to King’s Cross ran from 8 February 2016 to 20 March 2016 at tfl.gov.uk/cycle-north-south.

We also consulted at the same time on initial ideas to simplify the road network in the King’s Cross area. See tfl.gov.uk/kings-cross-gyratory. As part of the Central London Grid, Camden Council also consulted on proposed cycling improvements to link with the North-South Cycle Superhighway at the junction of Judd Street and Euston Road, continuing along Midland Road. See consultations.wearecamden.org/culture-environment/midland. We ensured that people were aware of the other consultations so they could see them in context of one another and have full view of the larger picture.

We asked for views online at tfl.gov.uk/cycle-north-south, by emailing us at consultations@tfl.gov.uk, or by post at FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATIONS.

Leaflets were delivered to 80,000 properties along the proposed route and emails sent to more than one million road users alongside press advertisements, news coverage and community drop-in centres public exhibitions for the public people to ask questions and get more information.

2.1 Consultation structure

The proposals were broken down into 9 sections:

Section 1 - Farringdon Street (between Stonecutter Street and Holborn Viaduct)
Section 2 - Farringdon Street (between Holborn Viaduct and Charterhouse Street)
Section 3 - Farringdon Road and Saffron Hill (between Charterhouse Street and St. Cross Street)
Section 4 - Farringdon Road and Saffron Hill (between St. Cross Street and Ray Street)
Section 5 - Farringdon Road, Ray Street, Herbal Hill and Warner Street
Section 6 - Warner Street and Phoenix Place
Section 7 - Pakenham Street, Calthorpe Street and Cubitt Street
Section 8 - Ampton Street, Sidmouth Street and Tavistock Place
Section 9 - Tavistock Place and Judd Street
2.2 Consultation material, distribution and publicity

As part of the consultation, leaflets were delivered to 80,000 properties along the proposed route and emails sent to more than one million road users alongside press advertisements, news coverage and public exhibitions for people to ask questions and get more information.

We sent a multi-page colour A5 leaflet outlining the proposals to addresses in postcodes in a 0.5 mile radius of the proposed route. This was similar to the distribution area for the consultation on the first phase of the route, in which we proposed the phase 2 alignment (see Appendix C for a map of the distribution area). The leaflet summarised the proposals and gave a link to the online consultation information and survey.

Besides the leaflet through peoples doors, we also targeted social media advertising in the area, advertised the consultation in journals such as for the taxi trade and publications including the TfL page in The Metro, via the Knowledge Quarter, Camden and Islington Councils and in local newsletters.

There was also news coverage in the Camden New Journal, Islington Tribune, Islington and Hackney Gazette, other local media and pan-London media including cycling media.

More than one million emails were sent to those who travel in the area using our customer database (see Appendix D) and we held local exhibitions at:

- King's Cross Underground main ticket hall from 15.00 to 19.00 on Friday 12 February
- Horsfall Room, Kings Place, 90 York Way, NI 9AG on Monday 15 February from 18.30 to 20.30* and on Friday 19 February from 14.00 to 17.00*
- Farringdon Underground new Crossrail entrance in Cowcross Street from 15.00 to 19.00 on Friday 18 March

*At the Kings Place events the project teams for the King's Cross gyratory and Judd Street/Midland Road consultations were also present.

We emailed stakeholder groups and elected members (see Appendix E) including all those who gave us their emails for the first phase of the route to keep in touch with them. The email contained a summary of the proposals and a link to the consultation website.

Paper copies of the consultation information were also made available via Freepost on request.
2.3 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, AgeUK London, Guide Dogs, Royal National Institute of Blind People, 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 in different formats (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 tailored the way of communicating (leaflets, emails, press activity, adverts, social media etc.). For example an information and questionnaire pack available directly from TfL
3. Overview of consultation responses

We received 1,391 responses to the consultation, with 53 per cent fully supporting the proposals, rising to 70 per cent including those who partially supported the proposals. 28 per cent of respondents did not support the proposals while 2 per cent said they were not sure or did not give an opinion. This includes 31 emailed unique responses where our analyst ascribed a response to the closed question based on the comments (there is no change to the percentages when these responses are removed).

We received over 60 responses from stakeholder groups including residents groups, local businesses and campaign organisations such as accessibility groups and cycle groups, representing a range of views about the proposals and specific parts of them. Respondents included the London Taxi Driver Association, London TravelWatch, Hatton Garden BID and Royal Mail.

Around half of those who responded to the consultation also provided a detailed comment on the plans. Some suggested that the route should be longer while others commented on the locations of pedestrian crossings and the potential traffic impacts of the scheme.

This section provides a summary of the responses to the consultation including how people heard about the consultation, their method of responding and the distribution of respondents.

3.1 Summary of support for the proposals

The table below summarises the level of support for each section of the route from all respondents to the consultation.

The table shows that for each section of the route the majority of responses are in support of the route with between 49-63 per cent of respondents who answered the questions stating that they ‘fully support’ the proposals. Note that the percentages in this table have been calculated from the total number of respondents who provided an answer for each respective question and this does not include emailed responses where they did not specify their level of support but does where one was inferred.

Further detail about the level of support for each section of the route is provided in Appendix A: Detailed analysis of responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Fully support</th>
<th>Partially support</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 How respondents heard about and responded to the consultation

Respondents heard about the consultation through a range of sources, including promotional materials from TfL, notices in newspapers, newsletters, blogs and social media. 946 respondents responded to this question.

The most common source identified was from emails from TfL. The full breakdown of how respondents heard about the consultation is provided in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How respondents heard</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email from TfL</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising online (e.g. Google and TfL.gov)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet from TfL through door</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter or e-newsletter</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper (including online editions)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TfL exhibition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster or flyer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet from TfL representative on the street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,391</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| S1   | 487 | 63 | 54 | 7  | 10 | 1  | 205 | 27 | 14 | 2  |
| S2   | 456 | 59 | 59 | 8  | 13 | 2  | 234 | 30 | 9  | 1  |
| S3   | 427 | 58 | 75 | 10 | 10 | 1  | 209 | 29 | 10 | 1  |
| S4   | 421 | 58 | 69 | 10 | 12 | 2  | 212 | 29 | 8  | 1  |
| S5   | 410 | 58 | 67 | 9  | 18 | 3  | 205 | 29 | 9  | 1  |
| S6   | 423 | 61 | 51 | 7  | 16 | 2  | 195 | 28 | 13 | 2  |
| S7   | 418 | 60 | 56 | 8  | 13 | 2  | 194 | 28 | 16 | 2  |
| S8   | 415 | 59 | 59 | 8  | 12 | 2  | 205 | 29 | 14 | 2  |
| S9   | 429 | 49 | 63 | 7  | 17 | 2  | 358 | 41 | 12 | 1  |
During analysis we identified 68 near identical responses from employees of businesses in the Smithfield Market Tenants’ Association. As these responses duplicated those of their employers and were submitted together with them, they have been counted as support for those submissions, rather than as individually submitted responses (see section 3.17 for more information).

### 3.3 Postcodes of respondents

Of the 1,391 respondents, 790 provided a valid postcode. These postcodes were predominantly from addresses in central London. A breakdown of the top 10 postcode areas provided by respondents is provided in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postcode</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC1H</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1A</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1R</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC1X</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1V</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1N</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other postcode area</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 Distribution of respondents

The map below shows the distribution of respondents. Most responses came from postcodes in Islington, Camden, Hackney and the City of London.
3.5 Summary of issues raised by respondents

Below is a summary of the main issues raised during the consultation. For more detailed summaries, including issues raised by section, see Appendix A: Detailed analysis of responses.

Of the 1,391 people who responded to this consultation, 652 (47 per cent) provided a comment in the open text box. The most frequently raised issues related to the design of junctions, crossings and links, with respondents requesting changes or improvements. Some respondents also requested for the route to be longer, more direct or of higher quality, whilst others were concerned the scheme would increase the level of congestion or pollution, and the safety of the scheme. Another key issue mentioned was the proposed alignment of the scheme along Judd Street. The Royal National Institute of Blind People (RNIB) headquarters is located on this street and some respondents were concerned that the proposals will make the area less accessible for visually impaired people (many of these respondents used identical text, see section 3.17 for more information). Some Other respondents felt the proposed route would be safer for cyclists and/or pedestrians than the existing situation.
3.6 Summary of responses to Question 1 – ‘Do you support our overall proposals for the continuation of the North-South Cycle Superhighway (CS6) between Stonecutter Street and King’s Cross?’

We asked respondents to tell us whether they supported our overall proposal for the route between Stonecutter Street and King’s Cross. Of the 1,391 people who responded to this consultation, 1,360 respondents answered this question with 718 (53 per cent) stating that they support the proposal and 230 (17 per cent) partially supporting the proposal. Conversely, 379 (28 per cent) respondents stated that they did not support the proposal, 21 (2 per cent) were unsure about their level of support and 12 (1 per cent) stated that they did not have an opinion on the matter.

Of the 1,391 people who responded to this consultation, 652 (47 per cent) provided a comment in the open text box for the scheme. Of the comments received, 380 (58 per cent) were generally negative, 218 (33 per cent) were generally positive and 54 (8 per cent) were neither negative nor positive about the scheme.

A detailed analysis of comments is in Appendix A and a summary of the top 10 issues raised and the number of respondents who mentioned them is provided in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The requirement to improve certain junctions, crossings and road links</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need to make the route more direct, longer or of higher quality</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals will increase congestion or pollution</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The alignment along Judd Street is not suitable because of its proximity to the RNIB headquarters and the proposals to remove the existing pelican crossing</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The route will be safer for cyclists and/or pedestrians than the existing situation</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More segregation is required for cyclists in the proposals</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The route is too disrupted by bus stops which present a hazard to cyclists</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals were perceived to be a waste of time or money or too much disruption</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is too much emphasis on cycling and cyclists, who are in the minority of road users, or that other road users aren't considered</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That cyclists will continue to cycle on the main carriageway despite the improvements or that cyclists are dangerous on the road</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 Summary of responses to Question 2 – ‘Do you support the proposals for Section 1 – Farringdon Street (between Stonecutter Street and Holborn Viaduct) – of the North-South Cycle Superhighway?’

We asked respondents to tell us whether they supported our proposals for Section 1 of the route on Farringdon Street, between Stonecutter Street and Holborn Viaduct. Of the 1,391 total respondents, 770 (55 per cent) provided a response to Question 2 with 487 (36 per cent) respondents in support and 54 (4 per cent) partially supporting the proposal. Conversely 205 (15 per cent) respondents stated that they did not support the proposals, 10 (1 per cent) were unsure about their level of support and 14 (1 per cent) stated that they did not have an opinion on the matter. The question was not answered by 590 (43 per cent) respondents.

Of the 1,391 people who responded to this consultation, 171 (13 per cent) provided a comment in the open text box for Section 1 of the route. Of the comments received, 108 (63 per cent) were generally positive, 32 (19 per cent) were generally negative and 31 (18 per cent) were neither negative nor positive about the scheme.

The most frequently raised issues related to the design the scheme including the level of cycle segregation, the proximity of parking bays to the cycle lanes and the potential for the scheme to increase the level of congestion or pollution.

A detailed analysis of comments is in Appendix A and a summary of the top 10 issues raised and the number of respondents who mentioned them is provided in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting the proposals</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially supporting the proposals</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not support</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 1,391 people who responded to this consultation, 171 (13 per cent) provided a comment in the open text box for Section 1 of the route. Of the comments received, 108 (63 per cent) were generally positive, 32 (19 per cent) were generally negative and 31 (18 per cent) were neither negative nor positive about the scheme.

The most frequently raised issues related to the design the scheme including the level of cycle segregation, the proximity of parking bays to the cycle lanes and the potential for the scheme to increase the level of congestion or pollution.

A detailed analysis of comments is in Appendix A and a summary of the top 10 issues raised and the number of respondents who mentioned them is provided in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxi / parking / motorcycle bays should be on the outside of the cycle track rather than the inside as proposed</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals will increase congestion or pollution</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More segregation is required for cyclists in the proposals</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference was stated for a segregated or two-way cycle track</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals were perceived to be a waste of time or money or too much disruption</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is too much emphasis on cycling and cyclists or that other road users aren't considered</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There will be an increase in journey times as a result of the proposals</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals conflict with existing parking arrangements or do not leave enough room for motorists</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The requirement to improve certain junctions</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The two-stage right turns are not ideal or cyclists will jump red lights if they don't change quickly enough</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.8 Summary of responses to Question 3 – ‘Do you support the proposals for Section 2 – Farringdon Street (between Holborn Viaduct and Charterhouse Street) – of the North-South Cycle Superhighway?’

We asked respondents to tell us whether they supported our proposals for Section 2 of the route on Farringdon Street, between Holborn Viaduct and Charterhouse Street. Of the 1,391 total respondents 771 (56 per cent) provided a response to Question 3, with 456 (34 per cent) respondents in support and 59 (4 per cent) partially supporting the proposal. Conversely 234 (17 per cent) respondents stated that they did not support the proposals, 13 (1 per cent) were unsure about their level of support and 9 (1 per cent) stated that they did not have an opinion on the matter. The question was not answered by 589 (43 per cent) respondents.

Of the 1,391 people who responded to this consultation, 184 (14 per cent) provided a comment in the open text box for Section 2. Of the comments received, 121 (66 per cent) were generally negative, 35 (19 per cent) were generally positive and 28 (15 per cent) were neither negative nor positive about the scheme.

The most frequently raised issues related to the potential for the scheme to increase the level of congestion or pollution, the design the scheme including junctions and the level of segregation of the track, the safety of the scheme and the general necessity of the scheme.

A detailed analysis of comments is in Appendix A and a summary of the top 10 issues raised and the number of respondents who mentioned them is provided in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposals will increase congestion or pollution</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed design for the Snow Hill junction needs to be improved</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference was stated for a segregated or two-way cycle track</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need to improve certain junctions</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More segregation is required for cyclists in the proposals</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The route will be safer for cyclists and/or pedestrians than the existing situation</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The safety or accessibility of the route needs to be improved</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is too much emphasis on cycling and cyclists or that other road users aren't considered</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals were perceived to be a waste of time or money or too much disruption</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals will make the route more dangerous from the existing situation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.9 Summary of responses to Question 4 – ‘Do you support the proposals for Section 3 – Farringdon Road and Saffron Hill (between Charterhouse Street and St Cross Street) – of the North-South Cycle Superhighway?’

We asked respondents to tell us whether they supported our proposals for Section 3 of the route on Farringdon Road and Saffron Hill, between Charterhouse Street and St Cross Street. Of the 1,391 total respondents, 731 (53 per cent) provided a response to Question 4, with 427 (31 per cent) respondents in support and 75 (6 per cent) partially supporting the proposal. Conversely, 209 (15 per cent) respondents stated that they did not support the proposals, 10 (1 per cent) were unsure about their level of support and 10 (1 per cent) stated that they did not have an opinion on the matter. The question was not answered by 629 (46 per cent) respondents.

Of the 1,391 people who responded to this consultation 184 (14 per cent) provided a comment in the open text box for Section 3. Of the comments received 130 (71 per cent) were generally negative, 27 (15 per cent) were generally positive and 27 (15 per cent) were neither negative nor positive about the scheme.

The most frequently raised issues related to the design and alignment of the scheme including the level of segregation and the indirectness of the route, the level of potential conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and buses, and the general safety of the scheme. The potential for the scheme to increase the level of congestion or pollution in the area was also raised.

A detailed analysis of comments is in Appendix A and a summary of the top 10 issues raised and the number of respondents who mentioned them is provided in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preference was stated for a segregated or two-way cycle track</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the route is indirect</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals will increase congestion or pollution</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The design of bus stops or bus stop bypasses need to be reviewed to</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensure the safety of pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are design conflicts between cyclists and buses on Farringdon</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More segregation is required for cyclists in the proposals</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the use of” back streets” for a Cycle Superhighway route is not</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals will make the route more dangerous from the existing</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That cyclists will continue to cycle on the main carriageway despite</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the improvements or that cyclists are dangerous on the road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The route will be safer for cyclists and/or pedestrians than the</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existing situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.10 Summary of responses to Question 5 – ‘Do you support the proposals for Section 4 – Farringdon Road and Saffron Hill (between St Cross Street and Ray Street) – of the North-South Cycle Superhighway?’

We asked respondents to tell us whether they supported our proposals for Section 4 of the route on Farringdon Road and Saffron Hill, between St Cross Street and Ray Street. Of the 1,391 total respondents 722 (52 per cent) provided a response to Question 5, with 421 (31 per cent) respondents in support and 69 (5 per cent) partially supporting the proposal. Conversely 212 (16 per cent) respondents stated that they did not support the proposals, 12 (1 per cent) were unsure about their level of support and 8 (1 per cent) stated that they did not have an opinion on the matter. The question was not answered by 638 (47 per cent) respondents.

Of the 1,391 people who responded to this consultation 171 (13 per cent) provided a comment in the open text box for Section 4. Of the comments received 122 (71 per cent) were generally negative, 29 (17 per cent) were neither negative nor positive and 20 (12 per cent) generally positive about the scheme.

The most frequently raised issues related to the potential for the scheme to increase the level of congestion or pollution, the design of elements of the scheme including the location of bus stops and the level of segregation, and the need to improve certain junctions. A number of respondents also commented that the use of “back streets” for a cycle super highway, stating that it is either is not suitable and/or that the route is indirect and should not split into two sections.

A detailed analysis of comments is in Appendix A and a summary of the top 10 issues raised and the number of respondents who mentioned them is provided in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposals will increase congestion or pollution</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stops should be removed from the cycle lanes</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need to improve certain junctions</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More segregation is required for cyclists in the proposals</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference was stated for a segregated or two-way cycle track</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the use of “back streets” for a Cycle Superhighway route is not ideal</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the diversion is not suitable or that the route should not be split</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals were perceived to be a waste of time or money or too much disruption</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of road space allocated to motor traffic should be reduced or roads should be closed</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The siting of the relocated bus stops needs to have consideration towards the safety of pedestrians and cyclists</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.11 Summary of responses to Question 6 – ‘Do you support the proposals for Section 5 – Farringdon Road, Ray Street, Herbal Hill and Warner Street – of the North-South Cycle Superhighway?’

We asked respondents to tell us whether they supported our proposals for Section 5 of the route on Farringdon Road, Ray Street, Herbal Hill and Warner Street. Of the 1,391 total respondents 709 (51 per cent) provided a response to Question 4 with 410 (30 per cent) respondents in support and 67 (5 per cent) partially supporting the proposal. Conversely 205 (15 per cent) respondents stated that they did not support the proposals, 18 (1 per cent) were unsure about their level of support and 9 (1 per cent) stated that they did not have an opinion on the matter. The question was not answered by 651 (48 per cent) respondents.

Of the 1,391 people who responded to this consultation, 153 (11 per cent) provided a comment in the open text box for Section 5. Of the comments received, 106 (69 per cent) were generally negative, 25 (16 per cent) were neither negative nor positive and 22 (14 per cent) were generally positive about the scheme.

The most frequently raised issues related to the design of the scheme including the level of segregation provided along the route and improvements to certain junctions, the potential for the reduction of traffic along sections of the route, and the potential for the scheme to increase the level of congestion or pollution. A number of respondents were also concerned that there is too much emphasis on cyclists and that other road users are forgotten.

A detailed analysis of comments is in Appendix A and a summary of the top 10 issues raised and the number of respondents who mentioned them is provided in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More segregation is required for cyclists in the proposals</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The volume of through-traffic should be reduced or the road should be</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closed to through-traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals will increase congestion or pollution</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals were perceived to be a waste of time or money or too much disruption</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need to improve certain junctions</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is too much emphasis on cycling and cyclists or that other road users aren’t considered</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals will make the route more dangerous from the existing situation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the diversion is not suitable / indirect or that the route should not be split</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That road space for motor traffic should not be reduced</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals should include more streets where two-way cycling is allowed</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.12 Summary of responses to Question 7 – ‘Do you support the proposals for Section 6 – Warner Street and Phoenix Place – of the North-South Cycle Superhighway?’

We asked respondents to tell us whether they supported our proposals for Section 6 of the route on Warner Street and Phoenix Place. Of the 1,391 total respondents, 698 (50 per cent) provided a response to Question 7 with 423 (31 per cent) respondents in support and 51 (4 per cent) partially supporting the proposal. Conversely, 195 (14 per cent) respondents stated that they did not support the proposals, 16 (1 per cent) were unsure about their level of support and 13 (1 per cent) stated that they did not have an opinion on the matter. The question was not answered by 662 (49 per cent) respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Partial support</th>
<th>Did not support</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Not answered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 1,391 people who responded to this consultation, 128 (9 per cent) provided a comment in the open text box for Section 6. Of the comments received 73 (57 per cent) were generally negative, 36 (28 per cent) were neither negative nor positive and 19 (15 per cent) were generally positive about the scheme.

The most frequently raised issues related to the design of the scheme including the level of segregation and provision of traffic calming measures along the route, the potential for the scheme to increase the level of congestion or pollution and the safety or accessibility of the scheme. A number of respondents also commented that despite the provision of a dedicated cycle lane, cyclists would continue to cycle on the main carriageway.

A detailed analysis of comments is in Appendix A and a summary of the top 10 issues raised and the number of respondents who mentioned them is provided in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More segregation is required for cyclists in the proposals</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals will increase congestion or pollution</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The safety or accessibility of the route needs to be improved</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased traffic calming is needed along the route</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That cyclists will continue to cycle on the main carriageway despite the improvements or that cyclists are dangerous on the road</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals were perceived to be a waste of time or money or too much disruption</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic should be removed or the volumes reduced</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the use of “back streets” for a cycle super highway route is not ideal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The route will be safer for cyclists and/or pedestrians than the existing situation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There will be an increase in journey times as a result of the proposals</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.13 Summary of responses to Question 8 – ‘Do you support the proposals for Section 7 – Pakenham Street, Calthorpe Street and Cubitt Street – of the North-South Cycle Superhighway?’

We asked respondents to tell us whether they supported our proposals for Section 7 of the route on Pakenham Street, Calthorpe Street and Cubitt Street. Of the 1,391 total respondents 697 (50 per cent) provided a response to Question 8 with 418 (31 per cent) respondents in support and 56 (4 per cent) partially supporting the proposal. Conversely 194 (14 per cent) respondents stated that they did not support the proposals, 13 (1 per cent) were unsure about their level of support and 16 (1 per cent) stated that they did not have an opinion on the matter. The question was not answered by 663 (49 per cent) respondents.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Partial support</th>
<th>Did not support</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Not answered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 1,391 people who responded to this consultation 135 (10 per cent) provided a comment in the open text box for the scheme. Of the comments received 77 (57 per cent) were generally negative, 33 (24 per cent) were neither negative nor positive and 25 (19 per cent) were generally positive about the scheme.

The most frequently raised issues related to the design of the scheme including the level of segregation and the potential for junction improvements along the route, the general safety and accessibility of the scheme, and the necessity of the scheme in terms of the money and time allocated to it. The potential for the scheme to increase the level of congestion or pollution was also mentioned by a number of respondents.

A detailed analysis of comments is in Appendix A and a summary of the top 10 issues raised and the number of respondents who mentioned them is provided in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More segregation is required for cyclists in the proposals or that the cycle lane should be widened or extended</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The safety or accessibility of the route needs to be improved</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals will increase congestion or pollution</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need to improve certain junctions or crossings</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals were perceived to be a waste of time or money or too much disruption</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed Superhighway should have priority over the roads that it crosses</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That cyclists will continue to cycle on the main carriageway despite the improvements or that cyclists are dangerous on the road</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There will be an increase in journey times as a result of the proposals</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That new or more suitable crossings are required</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The volume of traffic should be reduced or the road should be closed to through-traffic</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.14 Summary of responses to Question 9 – ‘Do you support the proposals for Section 8 – Ampton Street, Sidmouth Street and Tavistock Place – of the North-South Cycle Superhighway?’

We asked respondents to tell us whether they supported our proposals for Section 8 of the route on Ampton Street, Sidmouth Street and Tavistock Place. Of the 1,391 total respondents 705 (51 per cent) provided a response to Question 9, with 415 (59 per cent) respondents in support and 59 (4 per cent) partially supporting the proposal. Conversely, 205 (15 per cent) respondents stated that they did not support the proposals, 12 (1 per cent) were unsure about their level of support and 14 (1 per cent) stated that they did not have an opinion on the matter. The question was not answered by 655 (48 per cent) respondents.

Of the 1,391 people who responded to this consultation, 142 (10 per cent) provided a comment in the open text box for Section 8. Of the comments received, 91 (64 per cent) were generally negative, 28 (20 per cent) were neither negative nor positive and 23 (16 per cent) were generally positive about the scheme.

The most frequently raised issues related to the design of the scheme including the level of segregation along the route, the safety of scheme, the potential for the scheme to increase the level of congestion or pollution, and the necessity of the scheme in terms of the money and time allocated to it. A number of respondents also commented on the indirectness of the scheme and on the potential for it to increase journey times for all road users.

A detailed analysis of comments is in Appendix A and a summary of the top 10 issues raised and the number of respondents who mentioned them is provided in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More segregation is required for cyclists in the proposals or that the cycle lane should be widened or straightened</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the scheme is dangerous or that the safety and accessibility of the route needs to be improved</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals will increase congestion or pollution</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals were perceived to be a waste of time or money or too much disruption</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need to improve certain junctions</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the route is indirect</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There will be an increase in journey times as a result of the proposals</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The volume of traffic should be reduced or the road should be closed to through-traffic</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The route will be safer or more pleasant for cyclists and/or pedestrians than the existing situation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That new or more suitable crossings are required</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.15 Summary of responses to Question 10 – ‘Do you support the proposals for Section 9 – Tavistock Place and Judd Street – of the North-South Cycle Superhighway?’

We asked respondents to tell us whether they supported our proposals for Section 9 of the route on Tavistock Place and Judd Street. Of the 1,391 total respondents, 879 (63 per cent) provided a response to Question 10, with 429 (32 per cent) respondents in support and 63 (5 per cent) partially supporting the proposal. Conversely, 358 (26 per cent) respondents stated that they did not support the proposals, 17 (1 per cent) were unsure about their level of support and 12 (1 per cent) stated that they did not have an opinion on the matter. The question was not answered by 481 (35 per cent) respondents.

Of the 1,391 people who responded to this consultation, 333 (24 per cent) provided a comment in the open text box for Section 9. Of the comments received 261 (78 per cent) were generally negative, 40 (12 per cent) were neither negative nor positive and 32 (10 per cent) were generally positive about the scheme.

The most frequently raised issue related to the proposed alignment along Judd Street, which is the location of the RNIB headquarters, and the proposed replacement of a pelican crossing with a zebra crossing. We received a response from the RNIB about these issues with individual responses supporting the RNIB’s response (see section 3.17 for more information). Other issues related to the design of the scheme including the level of segregation and need to improve certain junctions, the general safety of the scheme and the potential for it to increase the level of congestion or pollution.
A detailed analysis of comments is in Appendix A and a summary of the top 10 issues raised and the number of respondents who mentioned them is provided in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The alignment along Judd Street along with the proposal to remove the existing pelican crossing is not suitable due to its proximity to the RNIB headquarters</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More segregation is required for cyclists in the proposals</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The safety or accessibility of the route needs to be improved</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals will increase congestion or pollution</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need to improve certain junctions</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That cyclists will continue to cycle on the main carriageway despite the improvements or that cyclists are dangerous on the road</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposals were perceived to be a waste of time or money or too much disruption</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The volume of traffic should be reduced or the road should be closed to through-traffic or that modal filtering should be introduced</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The route will be safer for cyclists and/or pedestrians than the existing situation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That segregation on links and at junctions is a positive thing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.16 Comments on the consultation process and materials

Of the total 1,391 respondents, 443 (32 per cent) provided a comment on the quality of the consultation and associated materials. Of the comments received, 291 (66 per cent) were generally positive, 90 (20 per cent) were generally negative and 62 (14 per cent) were neither negative nor positive. The main topics were:

- 73 (5% of all respondents) stated that the consultation or the materials provided were ‘clear’
- 41 respondents (3%) said that the materials provided were detailed or comprehensive
- 36 respondents (3%) stated clearer maps were needed, with 10 suggesting that the maps should be changed to be oriented to the north
- 22 respondents (2%) commented that the consultation was of good quality
- 13 respondents (<1%) suggested that we would not listen to their opinion
- 13 respondents (<1%) stated the consultation or the materials provided were informative
- 13 respondents (<1%) suggested that more information or detail was required
- 8 respondents (<1%) commented that the materials were hard to follow or were too technical
- 7 respondents (<1%) stated that the consultation was a waste of time or money
- 5 respondents (<1%) said that the consultation was not well advertised
- 5 respondents (<1%) commented that the consultation was concise
- 4 respondents (<1%) stated that the consultation was accessible for visually impaired people using screen readers
- 3 respondents (<1%) said that there was not enough time given for the public to respond to the consultation
- 3 respondents (<1%) said that the sub-parts for each section of the route were confusing
- 3 respondents (<1%) recommended that a hard copy of the consultation should have been provided as well as the online version
- 2 respondents (<1%) stated that the consultation materials were not accessible for visually impaired people
3.17 Petitions and campaigns

We received a response from Smithfield Market Tenants' Association which did not support the proposals as it was concerned about traffic flows at the junction of West Smithfield / Snow Hill with Farringdon Street. 24 businesses within Smithfield Market Tenants' Association and their employees submitted responses in support of the Smithfield Market Tenants' Association response about the impact it would have on their businesses as it is the main southbound exit from the Market stating that the proposal would lead to gridlock as well as leading to greater danger for all road users and cyclists and pedestrians in particular.

During analysis we identified 68 near identical responses from employees of businesses in the Smithfield Market Tenants' Association. As these responses duplicated those of their employers and were submitted together with them, they have been counted as support for those submissions, rather than as individually submitted responses on the basis that they were each made-up of identical or very similar text, which is a common occurrence during public consultations. As it was made clear the responses were all in support of the Smithfield Market Tenants' Association response we have included this information in our summary.

The London Cycling Campaign encouraged its members and supporters to respond to the consultation and supplied some suggested text, which was fully or partially adopted by some respondents who submitted individual responses. We have noted in our analysis of issues raised in Appendix A where this template text has been used.

We also received a response from the Royal National Institute of Blind People (RNIB), with individual responses supporting the RNIB's response. 170 responses referred to the RNIB on Judd Street, but were all individually submitted responses.
3.18 Summary of individual stakeholder responses

This is a summary of the feedback we received from stakeholders. Although we have summarised the responses for this report, the full responses were used for analysis. As well as being individually summarised here, stakeholder responses are included in the analysis of overall responses summarised elsewhere in Chapter 3 and Appendix A.

Local Authorities, local representatives and national bodies

City of London Corporation

The City Corporation supports the principle of Cycle Superhighways but is concerned that this scheme does not take into account the needs of the local community. In particular, they highlight the location where the bi-directional track is split and request an alternative location and question the need for bi-directional track at Tudor Street. They express concerns that the Snow Hill junction designs have not taken into account the existing high levels of injury collisions and state that a more appropriate junction control is required at this location.

Camden Council

Camden Council officers support the proposal which will provide increased protection for cyclists. Camden’s Transport Strategy places pedestrians at the top of the road user hierarchy, followed by cycling and public transport. It is accepted that some level of compromise is required in pedestrian facilities to provide the Cycle Superhighway. However, the current proposal shows pedestrian waiting times at crossings points to be above normal recommendation. There is concern over interaction between pedestrians and cyclists at junctions and crossings. There is also concern about the anticipated use of Farringdon Road north of the junction with Greville Street by cyclists. They ask that in tandem with the planned route on Saffron and Herbal Hill, TfL fully considers the benefits of making further improvements for cycling on Farringdon Road to account for the use of this route. To address increased journey times to key bus routes and predicted reassignment on borough roads they ask that following implementation, TfL should conduct after-monitoring of key borough roads for a period to be agreed with Council officers. This data should be compared to “before” data to ascertain the impact of the scheme and following discussions with Camden officers investigate further mitigation methods as required. This should occur as soon as is reasonably possible after identifying problematic traffic reassignment and journey times which have shown a consistent increase.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM, London Assembly Liberal Democrat Group

Broadly in favour of the proposal but reflects concerns of the RNIB.
Julian Fulbrook, Labour Councillor for Holborn and Covent Garden and Camden Cycling Champion

Broadly supportive of the proposal but has very serious concerns about the route along Greville Street and Saffron Hill and says that the majority of cyclists will keep heading north on Farringdon Road. Concerned about the number of pedestrians coming out of Farringdon Station toward Hatton Garden and potential for conflict with cyclists. Notes that the number of pedestrians will increase with CrossRail. Also concerned that the residents in Saffron Hill north of Greville Street and particularly clustered around The Ziggurat will be adversely affected by cyclists and for access and deliveries. Proposes that the route follows Farringdon Road as the direct route.

Historic England

Says that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on heritage assets of archaeological interest because of the likely depth and nature of buried remains. Says that if any more extensive areas of deeper ground disturbance are required then it would need to reconsider this advice as mitigation measures might be needed.

Emergency services

City of London Police

Expresses concern that the stepped cycle track will increase the risk of accidents for cyclists and motorcyclists due to loss of control. Concern that motorcyclists wishing to park will need to cross the cycle track resulting in potential loss of control or conflict with other users. Requires clarification about where the stepped cycle track will start and whether it will be stepped across the junction with Snow Hill. Also requires clarification about whether the taxi provision to the south of Newcastle Close will be a taxi parking / rest bay as opposed to a taxi rank authorised by the Commissioner of Police.

London Fire Brigade and London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority

Supports the proposal but says about Sections 5, 7, 8 & 9 that the area is generally congested and implementing one-way traffic and introducing cycle lanes is likely to affect Fire Brigade attendance in the area.

Accessibility Groups

Guide Dogs

Accepts that there is a need to segregate cyclists and other road users but suggests that this shouldn’t be at the expense of pedestrianised space. Expresses concern for clients using the RNIB centre on Judd Street and the negative impact that increased
cycle volumes will have on their accessibility and confidence. The organisation also shares all opinions and concerns raised by RNIB.

**National Federation of the Blind in the UK**

Expresses concern that visually impaired users of the RNIB premises will struggle to negotiate their way to the centre if the pelican crossing is removed as they will not be able cross the street safely. Recommends that if the cycle route is aligned along Judd Street that the pelican crossing is retained.

**Sutton Vision**

Expresses concern that visually impaired people who know the area will find the changes and having to relearn the area very difficult. Concern that the proposals will impinge on the independence and safety of visually impaired people. Suggests that other back streets or quieter roads should be used instead for cycle route

**Royal National Institute of Blind People (RNIB)**

The key points raised have been summarised below:

- States a preference for the route to be aligned away from Judd Street and the surrounding area

- The replacement of the pelican crossing with a zebra crossing will make it difficult for visually impaired people to access the RNIB facility who rely on the sound and rotating cone at the signalised crossing

- The vulnerability of blind and partially sighted RNIB staff and visitors crossing against cyclists who are generally silent and may not realise they can't see them and the impact on their independence has not been considered

- The proposals are highly detrimental to the safety of visually impaired staff and visitors such as that blind and partially sighted people need kerbs to navigate and orientate themselves and to provide a demarcation with the road. With raised junctions without kerbs they risk, unknowingly, walking into the road. Also blind and partially sighted people need consistent tactile paving

- Supports the principle of the Cycle Superhighway other than its alignment along Judd Street

- Says the RNIB were not consulted in good time


Supports the RNIBs response.
Transport and road user groups

Confederation of Passenger Transport

Concerned about reducing the available road space and impact on buses, coaches and other road users which will have a significant, potentially severe and ultimately perhaps devastating impact on the operations which bring thousands of tourists and commuters into London on a daily basis, providing a vital mode of transport and contributing massively to the London economy. Notes that Farringdon Road is part of a vital artery linking the international transport hubs of Kings Cross / St Pancras with destinations in the City of London and south of the River. Says the effect on bus routes in the area will be devastating and push yet more passengers on to an already stretched Northern line. Concerned that the effect on tourism will be harder to predict but as a key route for coach transfers from St Pancras Eurostar route, Farringdon Road is an important corridor to access hotels in the City and south of the river, avoiding the increasingly congested alternatives.

Also concerned that where road space, and in particular carriageway widths are restricted or reduced, the risk to vulnerable road users is significantly increased. Whereas this scheme proposes providing dedicated cycle lanes, it says it fails to recognise the risk to other vulnerable road users such as motorcyclists.

Re-expresses concern over bus stop by-passes and the safety of pedestrians.

Would like mixed use loading bays for the use of coaches.

Licensed Taxi Drivers Association

States that the North-South Cycle Superhighway has already caused significant traffic congestion where it has been implemented so far. Comments that the scheme has a negative impact on public transport users.

London TravelWatch

Says that this proposal involves many compromises for users and that the balance struck fails to respond to the concerns of disabled groups regarding their clients being able to comfortably use bus stops to board and alight buses. It said that at the time of the consultation there were many other Cycle Superhighway proposals that precluded it giving this one its full consideration and that it seems strange to route cycles south on one road and north on another. London TravelWatch would like to see an approach taken that strikes a better balance between all users and would wish to discuss these issues about a more inclusive approach that caters for all users with the designers.

Sustrans

Supports the proposal between St Bride Street and Greville Street and partially supports the proposal from Greville Street to King’s Cross.
States a preference for the continuation of segregated facilities along the length of Farringdon Road although acknowledges that the proposal are an enhancement for walking and cycling. Suggests that the right turning facility between Farringdon Road and Snow Hill / West Smithfield provides insufficient space for cyclists making the movement.

Raises safety concerns about the location of bus stops due to the potential conflict with cyclists.

Recommends that additional measures are implemented to slow vehicles along Phoenix Place, especially around the entrance to the Royal Mail depot.

Additional measures should be provided for cyclists at the junction of Calthorpe Street which is currently uncontrolled and creates significant delay.

Expresses concern about the location of parking bays on the inside of a cycle track and recommends that they are repositioned on the outside. States the plans do not include details of entry and exit facilities for cyclists from the stepped track and suggests that these should include dropped kerbs and clear exit points for cyclists to access shops, cycle parking and key streets. Questions the proposal to carry high volumes of cyclists on back streets which have limited capacity, and the overall coherence of the route due to the separation of north and south movements. States a preference for northbound stepped tracks along the length of Farringdon Road.

**Vision Zero London**

Expresses concern about bus stops interrupting the cycle lane and suggests that the Saffron Hill crossing at Clerkenwell Road should be kept as a zebra with priority to Cycle Superhighway traffic. Suggests that protected cycle tracks are required on Clerkenwell Road, that Ray Street should be one-way eastbound and that Phoenix Place should have priority over Calthorpe Street. Recommends that the speed of traffic on Judd Street is reduced or greater protection provided for cyclists.

**Wheels for Wellbeing**

Recommend that parking should be on the outside of the cycle lane, near the carriageway. Suggest that bus stops on the cycle route are not consistent with a segregated route and that early start is not suitable for large cycles that are unable to reach the advanced stop line on Tavistock Place.

States that the pelican crossing on Judd Street should remain if RNIB deem it necessary.

**Dial-a-Cab**

States that the Superhighway will increase congestion, pollution and journey times. Recommends that additional restrictions are put in place for cyclists, including undergoing a proficiency test, having insurance and displaying identification.
Cycle Groups

Brent Cyclists

Expresses concern that there are too many sections of low quality, intermittent cycle lanes. The route is indirect and should not split but instead remain on direct, main roads with segregation and stepped cycle tracks along its entire length. There are a number of poor junction / crossing designs, including at Snow Hill, Charterhouse Street, Clerkenwell Road and Ray Street, which should be reviewed. Supports the use of bus stop bypasses and segregated lanes but thinks that parking bays should be on the outside of the cycle lane, beside the main carriageway, to reduce conflict. The signalised crossings between the two-way and one-way sections of the route should not cause significant delay to journeys. Toucan crossings should not be shared, but should have marked cycle and pedestrian sections. If back roads are used, traffic should be removed from Warner Street and Ray Street and physical traffic calming measures should be avoided. Suggests that cycle symbols, advisory lanes and ASLs are not a suitable solution for a cycle super highway.

CTC London representative

Interconnection and clear signing with other cycle routes will be necessary.

Opportunities to make streets including Greville Street, Cross Street and Saffron Hill two way for cycling, in addition opportunities for cycle parking should be included in proposals.

Cycling Embassy of Great Britain

States that the route is indirect and that delays should be minimised with priority established as much as possible. Recommends additional road closures and reduction of traffic. A continuous foot/cycle way should be provided across the Snow Hill / West Smithfield entrance to better establish priority. Parking should be removed from Saffron Hill and Herbal Hill should be closed to traffic and two-way cycling permitted on both roads. A modal filter should be introduced on Warner Street to limit through traffic. Bus stop islands should be provided on Farringdon Road instead of stops in the cycle lane. The cycle super highway should have priority over Calthorpe Street and at the junction of Pakenham / Wren Street. Traffic calming measures on Ampton Street should be reviewed. The pelican crossing on Judd Street should be retained for users with visual impairment.

London Cycling Campaign

Partially supports the scheme. Does not support the splitting of the track at Greville Street as cyclists are likely to split into two groups of risk-averse and risk-aware cyclists, and states a preference for a two-way track or two ‘with flow’ tracks on Farringdon Road. States that there is the capacity to create two-way flows if the northbound bus lane on Farringdon Road is removed or if a bus stop bypass is
provided. Expresses concern about the location of bus stops in the southbound track and hook risks / conflicts at several junctions including Snow Hill / West Smithfield, Charterhouse Street, Clerkenwell Road and Ray Street. Recommends that the junction of Snow Hill / West Smithfield is either signalised in concert with the Charterhouse Street junction, or has radical traffic calming. States that the use of two paint colours at junctions is confusing and that early release signals are not idea for enabling all-ages, all-abilities cycling. States that the proposal to provide parking bays between the track and the footway would create conflicts between cyclists and motorised road users. Proposes that Greville Street should be two-way to enable the likely desired movement by cyclists and that Ray Street and Warner Street have modal filters to reduce the potential for rat-running.

States a preference for a tiger crossing rather than a zebra at Pakenham Street, with alignment closer to the junction with Phoenix Place. Wands at the centre and start / end of the track should be provided to reduce any risk of drivers using it as a shortcut. Expresses concern that the link between Cubitt Street and Ampton Street is too narrow and recommends it is widened to over four metres. Also recommends that the cycle bypasses on Sidmouth Street are widened to a minimum of 1.5m. Supports the modal filtering of Judd Street to through traffic and recommends the retention of the pelican crossing to enable RNIB visitors to cross in comfort.

Suggests that all schemes should be given a CLoS rating and should adhere to the latest London Cycle Design Standards to eliminate ‘critical fails’ prior to funding or public consultation.

**Camden Cycling Campaign**

Strongly supports the proposal and gave a detailed response. Referred to the ‘Clerkenwell Boulevard’. Would like consistent treatment where the cycle track crosses signalised junctions.

Objects to the motorcycle and taxi parking inside the southbound stepped track on Farringdon Street, opposite Stonecutter Street.

Concerned about the safety of cyclists and the difficult manoeuvres at the proposed non-signalised Snow Hill / West Smithfield and Farringdon Street junction. Would like a cycle-only stage in the signals for cycles on Farringdon Road and cycles emerging from Snow Hill.

Would like ‘Keep Clear’ signs on both the northbound and southbound carriageways at the five points where cycles cross motors. Would like the left turn banned at Charterhouse Street and Farringdon Street junction.

Says two-way cycling should be provided to enable southbound cycles on Hatton Garden to rejoin the route and to improve permeability in the area.
Proposes a floating bus stop at the bus stop north of Cowcross Street and another near to Clerkenwell Road as strongly objects to the proposal that cyclists should move out to overtake the bus at the stop.

Where there are banned turns for motor vehicles it would like it made clear that cycles can turn left.

Would like cycle icons painted on the road as these tend to encourage ‘taking the lane’ and also discourage aggressive tailgating and/or dangerous overtaking, and signage to indicate ‘shared space’.

Would like all guardrails to be removed.

Strongly in favour of a closure at Euston Road as proposed in the Midland Road consultation and the closure of Lansdowne Terrace as proposed in the Brunswick Square consultation.

Islington Cyclists Action Group
Endorses Camden Cycling Campaign comments.

Bicycle Users Group at the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine
Enthusiastically supports the proposal. Says that as in many organisations in London, a large and fast-growing number of students and employees at the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine cycle to work. An even larger proportion would cycle if they felt comfortable and safe on the roads. Says it is excited about this opportunity to improve the health of Londoners by encouraging more people to use a bicycle to get across London.

Business groups

Hatton Garden Business Improvement District

The Hatton Garden BID highlights the importance of the quality of urban realm and the ability for people and vehicles to move around effectively to support local businesses. The BID recognises the desire to increase and improve cycling provision across London and support the principle of promoting sustainable travel but considers there must be a balance in delivering schemes that takes into account other needs, including servicing and deliver arrangements.

They question whether the safety of pedestrians and cyclists has been taken into account in areas like Saffron Hill and St Cross Street. They ask what will be the impact on servicing and deliveries on Greville Street and surrounding streets and they ask what the specific plans are for widening Greville Street to create a public space? They also ask what the timetable of the works to be carried out and the need for businesses to make contingency plans during this period.
Royal Mail Group
The Royal Mail Groups highlighted their statutory duties to provide delivery services and the implications this has for access and movement of vehicles. Whilst no longer utilising bicycles for business purposes, they stated their encouragement of staff to commute to work by this mode and welcome TfL’s wider commitment to the provision of cycling infrastructure in this regard.

They note that the scheme will significantly increase the time taken to access their Mount Pleasant depot but acknowledge the wider benefits to local road users. Of greater importance to them is the potential impact of redevelopment of this site and adjacent land on Phoenix Place and resultant change in access requirements. They highlight the current level of large deliver vehicles that already use Phoenix Place and the impact of additional construction traffic, which may not make it a 'quiet' place to cycle.

They note the proposed change in junction priority at Mount Pleasant/Phoenix Place/ Warner Street and request that on-going mail centre access off this junction is taken into account.

Smithfield Market Tenants’ Association
Concerned about traffic flows at the junction of West Smithfield / Snow Hill with Farringdon Street. Suggest that the proposals will increase safety risks for all road users. Propose that the Snow Hill junction is not changed but if it is reduced to one lane, that users can only turn left onto Farringdon Street with users turning right required to use the Charterhouse Street / Farrington Road junction.

Businesses, employers and venues
Sainsbury’s Supermarkets Ltd
Would like to discuss how deliveries for the Sainsbury’s store on the northbound side of Farringdon Rd will be affected.

Individual businesses within Smithfield Market Tenants’ Association
Businesses within Smithfield Market Tenants’ Association and their employees submitted individual responses in addition to Smithfield Market Tenants’ Association response and endorsed it. The businesses which submitted the responses are listed below:

- Abbijoe Ltd
- Abasalom & Tribe Ltd
- B.J. Meats Ltd
- Central Meat Ltd
- D.P. Meats Ltd
- Darmenn and Curl Ltd
- David Andrade & Sons Ltd (plus 11 paper responses from employees)
- Denton Bros.
- Edward Price & Partners Ltd
- Finclass Ltd
- George Abrahams Co.
- G & E Meats Ltd
- G. Lawrence Wholesale Meat Co. Ltd
- H& C Meats Ltd
- H. Smith Ltd
- James Burden Ltd
- J. F. Edwards (plus 52 paper responses from employees)
- Keevil & Keevil
- Market Provisions Ltd
- Peter Thompson Group Ltd
- P J Martinelli Ltd
- PW & JK Killby Ltd (plus 5 paper responses from employees)
- Rhonda Meats Ltd
- William Warman & Guttridge Ltd

Knowledge Quarter

Broadly supports the proposal. Its vision for the KQ is for the area to be considered a loosely-integrated campus. Central to this is to ensure permeability between institutions in all parts of the KQ. Currently the KQ area is divided by Euston Road which acts as a real physical barrier between institutions in the south and north parts of the KQ. The KQ is supportive of measures which improve permeability - this includes traffic calming and better pedestrian facilities. The KQ is supportive of measures which improve the area’s air quality. At the same time, the KQ’s organisations are varied in nature. Some will be more dependent than others on the use of LGV and HGVs for deliveries and others will rely on buses and taxis to attract visitors and tourists. Improvements for pedestrians are welcomed but says careful consideration needs to be placed on the impact on other road users. It believes the
Cycle Superhighway extension which allow employees, visitors and students within the KQ to travel more securely. This is especially important as it anticipates that continued development within the area will see the volume of cyclists and visitors increase - particularly with the arrival of new offices for Google, the Alan Turing Institute, the Francis Crick Institute and other occupiers within the King’s Cross Development.

**British Library**

States that the proposals will make the cycle routes between Holborn and St Pancras safer and faster. Support the alignment along Judd Street as it provides a convenient route to the Library.

**University of London**

Supports the vision to improve cycling in London, however would prefer to see segregated cycle lanes on each side of the road.

**Westminster Kingsway College**

Supports the proposal in principle. Says that it will be interested in how the Cycle Superhighway will integrate into local access routes for its students, staff and visitors and that the integration of routes will improve cycle safety and accessibility.

**Bleeding Heart Restaurants**

The Bleeding Heart Restaurant raises concern about the level of disruption the scheme could cause to an already constrained traffic system. They highlight the cycle route crosses four uncontrolled intersections whereas if the route went along Farringdon Road it would only cross one signalised junction. They also question if cyclist will actually bother to divert off Farringdon Road.

They raise concerns about access for refuse vehicles and emergency services, particularly on Greville Street.

They also highlight the existing traffic congestion leading to/from Holborn Circus and state that the scheme will make this worse and make it more difficult to access businesses in the area, including by taxi.

**Farringdon Street L.P.**

Farringdon Street L.P. focuses their response upon the section of the scheme between Stonecutter Street and Greville Street. They wish to ensure the scheme enhances the local environment on and around Shoe Lane; improves pedestrian permeability along key links from public transport interchanges; and has a positive impact on safety of all road users.
They have previously made clear their preference would be to retain a two-way segregated cycle facility on the west side of Farringdon Street.

In relation to the proposed scheme, they raise concerns about the detailed modelling of signals at crossing points; pedestrian safety at crossings; and the capacity of traffic islands and whether they are sufficient to meet pedestrian demand.

**Resident Groups**

**FAS Residents Association**

Do not support the proposal. States that there will be increased problems for vehicles parked on Ampton Street, delivery vehicles, refuse collection vehicles and maintenance vans due to lack of space and road closures, increasing the risk of accidents. The attitude and volume of cyclists will increase the risk of accidents for young children and older people living nearby. The scheme does not suit the environment of the road and is not wanted by residents.

**Ziggurat Freehold Limited (Residents Association)**

Does not support the proposal. Objects to the use of Saffron Hill stating that is unsuitable for many reasons, including: increased congestion on Clerkenwell Road, increased cycle traffic at the junction with Saffron Hill and limited access to St Cross Street restricting access to the Ziggurat. There will be conflicts with deliveries, parking and taxis impacting on older residents. Cyclists will not follow the diversion therefore it would be better to convert the existing bus lane on Farringdon Road into a cycle lane.

**Amwell Society**

Welcomes measures to make cycling safer and less intimidating but concerned at impact on pedestrians and motor vehicles. Questions whether it is really necessary to close Judd Street to through traffic now that Tavistock Place is eastbound only. Would mean the only option for travelling westwards will be via the Kings Cross gyratory, an intimidating route for many, particularly the growing number of elderly and disabled for whom car travel is the only option.
4. Conclusion and next steps

The consultation on detailed proposals for the second phase of the North-South Cycle Superhighway has proved a valuable exercise which has brought our attention to a number of issues and concerns which we continue to investigate. It has also demonstrated a good level of support for the proposals. We are currently reviewing the consultation responses and scheme designs with key stakeholders and our partners in the consultation, Camden and Islington Councils. We also continue to discuss the proposals with those most affected by the proposed changes to junctions, crossings and road links.

We plan to publish our ‘Response to issues raised’ and announce how we will proceed in autumn 2016.
Appendix A: Detailed analysis of responses

In this section we have grouped detailed comments into themes. Percentages given are from the total of 1,391 consultation responses.

Overall proposals for the continuation of the North-South Cycle Superhighway (CS6) between Stonecutter Street and King’s Cross

Impact on other road users: 195 comments were received about the impact of the scheme on other road users, including public transport users and drivers:

- 73 respondents (5%) commented that the proposals would result in increased congestion
- 44 respondents (3%) suggested that there is too much emphasis on cycling or providing improvements for cyclists
- 28 respondents (2%) said that the proposals would cause an increase in journey times for other road users
- 20 respondents (1%) commented that the scheme will make travelling more difficult for public transport users
- 15 respondents (1%) said that cycle facilities are rarely used by cyclists compared to the needs of other road users
- 5 respondents (<1%) suggested that the scheme will improve traffic flow
- 4 respondents (<1%) commented that there shouldn’t be any road closures or that road space shouldn’t be reduced
- 3 respondents (<1%) said that all road users should mix or that there shouldn’t be separation or users
- 3 respondents (<1%) recommended that public transport is improved instead of implementing the scheme

Impact on safety: 139 comments were received concerning the impact of the scheme on safety, in general and for specific users:

- 62 respondents (5%) commented that the scheme would be safer for cyclists or pedestrians
- 29 respondents (2%) said that the scheme would be more dangerous than the existing situation
- 17 respondents (1%) recommended that the safety or accessibility of the route be reviewed or improved
- 16 respondents (1%) stated that the scheme is dangerous for or doesn’t consider visually impaired people, but did not specifically reference the RNIB
• 15 respondents (1%) suggested that the scheme is dangerous or bad for pedestrians

Impact on cyclists: 75 of the comments received related to the impact of the scheme on cycling or cyclist’s movements:

• 40 respondents (3%) suggested that cyclists will continue to cycle on the main carriageway (referencing Farringdon Road) regardless of whether the scheme is implemented:

• 12 respondents (1%) stated that the proposals will be an improvement in cycling facilities

• 9 respondents (1%) said that the scheme would generate an increased uptake in cycling

• 3 respondents (<1%) recommended restricting cyclists’ access to main roads

Impact on the environment: 63 of the comments received related to the impact of the scheme on the environment:

• 15 respondents (1%) commented that the proposals would result in increased pollution

• 23 respondents (2%) stated that the scheme will create a better natural and physical environment or will lead to less pollution or improvements in people’s health

• 14 respondents (1%) said that a polluted and noisy environment creates a health risk

• 10 respondents (1%) suggested that the scheme will ease congestion

Junction and crossing design: 84 of the comments received related to the design of crossings or junctions included in the scheme:

• 78 respondents (6%) stated that junctions required improvement to improve road safety for all road users.
  ▪ 44 respondents (3%) referenced the Snow Hill / West Smithfield junction
  ▪ 40 respondents (3%) referenced the Charterhouse Street junction
  ▪ 38 respondents (3%) referenced the Clerkenwell Road junction
  ▪ 37 respondents (3%) referenced the Ray Street junction

• 50 respondents (4%) expressed concern that the revised junction layout will increase the risk of cycle conflicts with motor traffic of which 27 (2%) respondents used the standard response on behalf of London Cycle Campaign “I'm also particularly concerned with several poor junction designs that retain conflict and hook risks - at Snow Hill, Charterhouse Street, Clerkenwell Road and Ray Street particularly.”
• 10 respondents (<1%) expressed concern that the junctions would lead to an increase in risk for pedestrians with 5 stating the potential danger of pedestrian conflict with motor traffic and 5 stating the potential danger of pedestrian conflict with cyclist

• 17 respondents (<1%) made general comments about improvements to junctions

• 2 respondents (<1%) made general comments about improvements to crossings

• 2 respondents (<1%) referenced the Judd Street crossing, but did not reference the RNIB facility

• 2 respondents (<1%) objected to the removal of controlled crossings.

• 2 respondents (<1%) wanted to see junctions reprioritised with 1 specifically mentioning the junction with Calthorpe Street

• 2 respondents (<1%) raised concern that the proposed changes at Snow Hill/West Smithfield junction will impact on traffic flow and access to Smithfield Market.

• 3 respondents (<1%) suggested that banned turns are not favourable

• 2 respondents (<1%) commented that early release at junctions is a good idea

• 1 respondent (<1%) said that eastbound crossings from Farringdon Station need to be reviewed to accommodate future high volumes of pedestrians from Crossrail

**Route alignment:** 75 respondents (6%) commented that the alignment route should either be more direct or that the route should be extended:

• 47 respondents (4%) suggested that the route should continue on Farringdon Road rather than diverting onto backstreets

• 27 respondents (2%) used the standard response on behalf of London Cycle Campaign “there are also too many sections of low-quality track interrupted by bus stops, and I do not agree splitting the scheme at Greville Street is a good solution. The removal of a rarely used bus lane on Farringdon Road to Clerkenwell Road would enable a far better scheme”

• 23 respondents (2%) said that back streets are not suitable for the route or for a Cycle Superhighway

• 11 respondents (1%) provided a general comment that the route should be more direct

• 3 respondents (<1%) recommended providing improved links to Caledonian Road

• 1 respondent (<1%) suggested using Gray’s Inn Road to access King’s Cross
• 1 respondent (<1%) commented that a more direct route should be used from King’s Cross to Phoenix Place

• 1 respondent (<1%) provided a general comment about extending the route to residential areas

• 1 respondent (<1%) commented that the route should be extended across Camden Borough

• 1 respondent (<1%) suggested that the route should be extended towards Holborn from Roseberry Avenue

• 1 respondent (<1%) recommended providing a connection to Argyle Street

**Bus lanes, stops and parking bays:** 89 Respondents made comments related to conflicts between the route and bus lanes, stops and parking bays:

• 49 respondents (4%) stated that there were too many bus stops in the cycle lane or that cyclists would be forced to move into the main carriageway. 27 of these respondents (2%) used the standard response on behalf of London Cycle Campaign “there are also too many sections of low-quality track interrupted by bus stops”

• 34 respondents (3%) recommended that bus lanes should be removed to provide the additional cycle lane capacity

• 33 respondents (3%) stated that the bus lane on Farringdon Road should be removed

• 1 respondent (<1%) made a general comment about bus lanes

• 20 respondents (1%) commented that taxi / motorcycle / parking bays should be provided on the outside of the cycle track beside the main carriageway, rather than on the inside as proposed

**Judd St/conflict with RNIB headquarters:** 79 respondents (6%) provided comments about the scheme’s route along Judd Street in respect of its proximity to the RNIB headquarters:

• 58 respondents (4%) commented that Judd Street is not suitable due to its location beside the RNIB headquarters

• 23 respondents (2%) expressed concern about the removal of the pelican crossing on Judd Street due to the negative impact for RNIB visitors and staff

• 19 respondents (1%) stated that the routing of the Cycle Superhighway by the RNIB facilities presented a potential danger for staff and visitors

• 12 respondents (1%) stated that the proposal to provide a zebra crossing was not suitable due to the presence of people with visually impairments

• 10 respondents (1%) recommended that the use of Judd Street be reconsidered but did not make reference to the RNIB facility
- 8 respondents (<1%) suggested that the proposal to route the Cycle Superhighway along Judd Street would have a negative impact on people with visual impairments’ independence.
- 1 respondent (<1%) said that the addition of double yellow lines would make it more difficult for visitors to the RNIB facility to be dropped off by taxi.

**Route quality and design:** 67 respondents made comments related to the overall route quality and design of the proposed cycle superhighway:

- 32 respondents (2%) stated that the route should be of higher quality than the proposals.
- 11 respondents (1%) suggested that the width of the cycle routes should be increased.
- 7 respondents (1%) suggested that the whole route should have infrastructure to enable two-way cycling.
- 6 respondents (<1%) stated that greater separation was needed between pedestrians and cyclists, particularly at bus stops.
- 6 respondents (<1%) recommended pedestrianising or removing cars where possible.
- 3 respondents (<1%) stated that new or increased cycle parking was needed.
- 1 respondent (<1%) recommended that more trees should be provided.
- 1 respondent (<1%) suggested that additional Santander Cycle Hire bikes should be provided.

**Segregation:** 68 respondents made comments specifically related to the segregation of cycle lanes:

- 53 respondents (4%) suggested that more segregation was needed:
  - 37 (3%) respondents provided a general comment about the need for more segregation.
  - 12 (1%) respondents recommended that the whole route should be segregated.
  - 4 (<1%) respondents commented that there should be more segregation on Farringdon Road.
- 15 respondents (1%) made positive comments about segregation for cyclists.

**General negative comments:** 48 of the comments received provided generally negative comments about the scheme:

- 34 respondents (3%) said that the scheme was a waste of money.
- 10 respondents (1%) commented that the scheme would be too disruptive.
- 8 respondents (1%) said that the scheme was a waste of time

**Connectivity:** 16 of the comments received related to impacts on connectivity as a result of the scheme:

- 11 respondents (1%) commented that the scheme will result in better cycle connections
- 3 respondents (<1%) said that it would improve connections to key transport nodes
- 2 respondents (<1%) recommended ensuring that the scheme is well integrated with other cycle routes or other transport modes

**Comments about the scheme’s timescale:** One comment was received about the projected timescale, which requested that the scheme is built soon.
Section 1 – Farringdon Street (between Stonecutter Street and Holborn Viaduct)

Overview

We consulted on the alignment of the North-South Cycle Superhighway between Elephant & Castle and King’s Cross in autumn 2014. The section between Elephant & Castle and Stonecutter Street is now under construction. This consultation describes the detailed proposals for the route north of Stonecutter Street.

Key Proposals

- Stepped cycle tracks are vertically separated from the footway and main carriageway to provide protection, safety and comfort for cyclists
- The stepped cycle tracks would be on the western and eastern sides of Farringdon Street between Stonecutter Street and Charterhouse Street
- The tracks would be minimum of 2.5m wide, allowing space for cyclists to overtake
- Southbound cyclists on the North-South Cycle Superhighway would use the signalised cycle crossing at Stonecutter Street to join the two-way cycle track
- City of London has already confirmed plans for Stonecutter Street to be permanently closed to motor traffic following completion of nearby
construction works. Cycle access to and from Stonecutter Street would be maintained via a dropped kerb.

*Stepped cycle tracks are vertically separated from the footway and main carriageway*

Changes to parking and loading restrictions

- All single red lines would be replaced by double red lines (no stopping at any time) as there would not be space for vehicles to safely pass a stopped vehicle
- Motorcycle parking from western side and centre of road would be relocated to eastern side of the road
- The existing taxi and disabled parking bays on the western side of the road would be relocated to the eastern side, accessed via a low angled kerb across the cycle track
- New loading/disabled/motorcycle parking bays would also be provided on the eastern side of the road.

Improved pedestrian and cyclist crossings

- The existing pedestrian crossing at Stonecutter Street would be converted to a wide signalised pedestrian crossing across the motor vehicle traffic lanes with an informal crossing across the cycle track
- A cycle crossing would allow cyclists to cross from the cycle track on the east side to the west side
- Entry to side roads on the eastern side of Farringdon Road would be raised to footway level to provide a continuous level footway for pedestrians and encourage vehicles to slow down when entering or exiting.

Urban realm improvements

- Reduced street clutter
• Potential for additional tree planting (subject to further investigations)

• Footway improvements and cycle hire docking station on Stonecutter Street and on the western side of Farringdon Street are part of a separate development that is not part of this consultation.

Temporary arrangements during development construction

• The carriageway space would be limited by the construction hoardings on Farringdon Street between Stonecutter Street and Holborn Viaduct. During this period, northbound cyclists would continue in a wide mandatory cycle lane separated from traffic by vertical ‘wands’ (flexible traffic poles). Stonecutter Street would remain open to construction vehicles for the duration of the works but would be closed in the final scheme. All vehicles accessing the site from Farringdon Street would be signal controlled across the northbound cycle lane.

Route design: 82 of the comments received commented on the proposed design and layout of the route, or provided alternative recommendations:

• 29 respondents (2%) commented on the location of taxi / parking / motorcycle bays on the inside of the cycle path rather than the outside

• 16 respondents (1%) suggested that more segregation was needed

• 12 respondents (1%) suggested that a segregated or two-way cycle track was preferable
  ▪ 4 respondents stated a preference for two-way cycle tracks rather than ‘with flow’ tracks
  ▪ 3 respondents provided general comments about the provision of a segregated or two-way track
  ▪ 3 respondents commented that a two-way track should be provided as far as Charterhouse Street
  ▪ 2 respondents suggested that a two-way track should be provided as far as Greville Street
  ▪ 1 respondent recommended providing a two-way track as far as Clerkenwell Road

• 6 respondents (<1%) recommended that the design of bus bypasses be reviewed to ensure that there aren’t any conflicts with pedestrians

• 6 respondents (<1%) provided positive comments about the proposed stepped cycle tracks

• 4 respondents (<1%) made positive comments about segregation for cyclists

• 2 respondents (<1%) said that two-way cycle tracks are not ideal
- 1 respondent (<1%) recommended extending the route north
- 1 respondent (<1%) recommended pedestrianising or removing cars where possible
- 1 respondent (<1%) provided negative comments about segregation for cyclists
- 1 respondent (<1%) suggested that all routes should be made with blue rubberised tarmac
- 1 respondent (<1%) commented that raised entries to side streets are dangerous
- 1 respondent (<1%) said that the southbound route has been neglected
- 1 respondent (<1%) provided a positive comment about bus stop bypasses

**Junction and crossing design:** 25 of the comments received related to the design of crossings or junctions included in the scheme:

- 10 respondents (1%) stated that junctions in general, or a specific junction, required improvement
- 5 respondents (<1%) requested that the transition between the cycle track and the main carriageway is reviewed
- 2 respondents (<1%) provided general negative comments about junction design
- 2 respondents (<1%) stated that there is a lack of clarity regarding the integration of the start of the route and the existing network
- 1 respondent (<1%) proposed that banned turns should be replaced with ASLs
- 8 respondents (1%) commented that two-stage right turns are not ideal or that cyclists will jump red lights if the signals do not change quickly enough
- 6 respondents (<1%) recommended that pedestrian crossings over the cycle tracks need improvements or clear signposting
- 4 respondents (<1%) raised concerns about informal pedestrian crossings over the cycle track and the potential safety risk
- 2 respondents (<1%) provided general comments about crossings.
- 1 respondent (<1%) provided a positive comment about bus stop bypasses

**Impact on other road users:** 74 comments were received about the impact of the scheme on other road users, including public transport users and drivers:
• 29 respondents (2%) said that the scheme will increase the level of congestion on the local highway network
• 11 respondents (1%) suggested that there is too much emphasis on cycling or providing improvements for cyclists
• 11 respondents (1%) said that the proposals would cause an increase in journey times for other road users
• 10 respondents (1%) commented that the scheme would create conflicts with parking or motorists
• 4 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme will make travelling more difficult for public transport users
• 4 respondents (<1%) said that cycle facilities are rarely used by cyclists compared to the needs of other road users or that road space shouldn’t be taken away from other users
• 2 respondents (<1%) said that all road users should mix or that there shouldn’t be separation or users
• 2 respondents (<1%) commented that the amount of motorcycle parking should be reduced
• 1 respondent (<1%) stated that more parking is required and that there is little space for vehicle users

**Impact on safety:** 17 comments were received concerning the impact of the scheme on safety, in general and for specific users:

• 7 respondents (1%) recommended that the safety or accessibility of the route be reviewed or improved
• 5 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme would be safer for cyclists or pedestrians
• 4 respondents (<1%) said that the scheme would be more dangerous than the existing situation
• 1 respondent (1%) stated that the scheme is dangerous for visually impaired people

**Impact on cyclists:** 9 of the comments received related to the impact of the scheme on cycling or cyclists movements:

• 7 respondents (1%) suggested that cyclists will continue to cycle on the main carriageway regardless of whether the scheme is implemented:
• 2 respondents (<1%) said that the scheme would generate an increased uptake in cycling

**Impact on the environment:** 5 of the comments received related to the impact of the scheme on the environment:
• 4 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme will increase or maintain pollution levels
• 1 respondent (<1%) commented that the scheme will create a better environment

General negative comments: 12 of the comments received provided generally negative comments about the scheme:

• 10 respondents (1%) said that the scheme was a waste of money
• 3 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme would be too disruptive
• 1 respondent (<1%) said that the scheme was a waste of time

Petitions and campaigns

We received a response from Smithfield Market Tenants' Association which did not support the proposals as it was concerned about traffic flows at the junction of West Smithfield / Snow Hill with Farringdon Street. 24 businesses within Smithfield Market Tenants' Association and their employees submitted responses in support of the Smithfield Market Tenants' Association response about the impact it would have on their businesses as it is the main southbound exit from the Market stating that the proposal would lead to gridlock as well as leading to greater danger for all road users and cyclists and pedestrians in particular.

During analysis we identified 68 near identical responses from employees of businesses in the Smithfield Market Tenants' Association and treated it as a campaign. On the basis that they were each made up of identical or very similar text, which is a common occurrence during public consultations. As it was made clear the responses were all in support of the Smithfield Market Tenants' Association response we have included this information in our summary.
Section 2 – Farringdon Street (between Holborn Viaduct and Charterhouse Street)

Overview

We consulted on the alignment of the North-South Cycle Superhighway between Elephant & Castle and King’s Cross in autumn 2014. The section between Elephant & Castle and Stonecutter Street is now under construction. This consultation describes the detailed proposals for the route north of Stonecutter Street.

Key Proposals

Northbound and southbound stepped cycle track replace northbound bus lane on Farringdon Street under Holborn Viaduct

- The stepped cycle tracks would be on the western and eastern sides of Farringdon Street between Stonecutter Street and Charterhouse Street
- The tracks would be minimum of 2.5m wide, allowing space for cyclists to overtake

Northbound segregated cycle track and southbound mandatory cycle lane replace one northbound bus lane on Farringdon Street

- The cycle facilities would be minimum of 1.5m wide
- Northbound cyclists would be segregated from other traffic by a segregation island between 0.5 and 2.5m wide
- Gaps in the segregation would enable access to and from the proposed Central London Grid (CLG) via West Smithfield (not part of this consultation)
- Northbound cyclists proceed with ahead traffic at the junction with Charterhouse Street to maximise green time while turning traffic is held back
- Early releases for cyclists at all arms at Charterhouse Street junction
- Use of colour at West Smithfield junction and Charterhouse Street junction to highlight the presence of cyclists to other traffic.

New bus stop bypasses

- Northbound bus stop HS (Snow Hill) and southbound bus stop HT (Snow Hill) on Farringdon Street would have a bypass for cyclists
- Cyclists would be directed behind each bus stop on a 1.5m cycle track. Bus passengers would access a waiting area by crossing the cycle track using a raised marked crossing point. The waiting area would be a minimum of 2.5m wide. Raised delineators either side of the cycle track indicate where it is flush with the footway
- The southbound footway would be narrowed by 1.2m outside Smithfield Market to accommodate the new bus stop bypass. Usable footway width would be maintained owing to the bus shelter being relocated to the island
- Bus stop bypasses are used elsewhere in London, the UK and Europe.
- Bus stops HS and HT are currently used by TfL bus routes 17, 45, 63, N63.

Changes to parking and loading restrictions

- All single red lines would be replaced by double red lines (no stopping at any time)
- The taxi, loading and disabled bays on the western side and centre of the road would be relocated to the segregation island
- The existing loading / disabled bay on the eastern side would be removed due to a lack of space for suitable relocation. Kerbside activity surveys show that this is not well used.

Changes to West Smithfield junction

- The footway would be widened and the location of the existing island altered
- The junction approach would be raised to footway level to reduce the speed of vehicles and to give pedestrians a level crossing point.

**Early release for cyclists**

- Early release signals would be provided for cyclists on all arms at the Charterhouse Street junction.

**‘Two-stage turn’ facilities at the Charterhouse Street junction**

- A ‘two-stage turn’ would be provided for cyclists wanting to turn right onto Charterhouse Street.

**New straight across signalised pedestrian crossings on all arms at Charterhouse Street junction**

- Four new straight across signalised pedestrian crossings at Charterhouse Street junction.

**Banned right turns onto Charterhouse Street (west) from Farringdon Road (north)**

- Banned right turn for southbound vehicles onto Charterhouse Street (west). Our latest traffic counts show that up to 104 vehicles per hour make this movement at the busiest times. Alternative routes for westbound traffic include Roseberry Avenue, Charterhouse Street/West Smithfield or Fleet Street.

**Urban realm and pedestrian improvements**

- Reduced street clutter

- Widening pavements at three of four corners at Charterhouse Street and at West Smithfield.

**Junction and crossing design:** 89 of the comments received related to the design of crossings or junctions included in the scheme:

- 60 respondents (4%) stated that junctions in general, or a specific junction, required improvement

- **General:**
  - 10 respondents (1%) commented that two-stage right-turns are not ideal
  - 7 respondents (1%) recommended that pedestrian crossings need improvements
  - 1 respondent (<1%) suggested that there should be pedestrian crossings at bus stop bypasses
- 1 respondent (<1%) queried how the signalised pedestrian crossings would be enforced
- 1 respondent (<1%) made general comments about improvements to pedestrian crossings
- 4 respondents (<1%) commented that early release at junctions is a good idea
- 2 respondents (<1%) said that ASLs should be removed

Snow Hill/West Smithfield junction

- 20 respondents (2%) provided general comments about the Snow Hill / West Smithfield junction
- 26 respondents (2%) suggested that users should only be able to turn left out of the Snow Hill / West Smithfield junction onto Farringdon Road
- 5 respondents (<1%) proposed that better protection should be provided for cyclists at the Snow Hill / West Smithfield junction, including buffers for cyclists turning left and protected lanes through the approach
- 2 respondents (<1%) commented that improved priority for pedestrians was required at the Snow Hill / West Smithfield junction
- 2 respondents (<1%) said that the Snow Hill / West Smithfield junction should be signalised, of which one recommended that it is signalised in concert with the Charterhouse Street junction
- 2 respondents (<1%) commented that there should be a zebra crossing at the Snow Hill / West Smithfield junction
- 1 respondent (<1%) expressed concern about the use of over-run at the exit from the Snow Hill / West Smithfield junction
- 1 respondent (<1%) suggested that right turns should be banned for cars travelling from Snow Hill / West Smithfield onto Farringdon Street

Charterhouse St junction

- 11 respondents (1%) provided general comments concerning the safety of the Charterhouse Street junction
- 2 respondents (<1%) made general comments about pedestrian crossings at the Charterhouse Street junction
- 2 respondents (<1%) recommended reviewing the waiting area for cyclists in front of the traffic lights to include blue markings or increased protection
- 2 respondents (<1%) commented that ‘hold the left’ at the Charterhouse Street junction is positive
- 1 respondent (<1%) commented that the early release system at the Charterhouse junction is not fully safe

**Route design:** 72 of the comments received commented on the proposed design of the route, or provided alternative recommendations:

- 34 respondents (3%) suggested that a two-way cycle track was preferable
  - 25 respondents (2%) recommended that the cycle track continues as a two-way route on the west side of Farringdon Road as far as Charterhouse Street
  - 6 respondents (<1%) provided general comments expressing that a two-way cycle track was preferable
  - 3 respondents (<1%) suggested that two-way tracks should continue as far as Greville Street
- 15 respondents (1%) suggested that more segregation was needed
  - 9 respondents (<1%) provided general comments about the need for more segregation
  - 3 respondents (<1%) suggested that more segregation was required on the southbound side of Farringdon Street
  - 1 respondent (<1%) recommended that the route is segregated across the Snow Hill junction
  - 1 respondent (<1%) recommended that the route is segregated as far as Charterhouse Street
  - 1 respondent (<1%) stated that they preferred full segregation over stepped tracks
- 6 respondents (<1%) stated that vehicle lanes should not be reduced
- 5 respondents (<1%) recommended that the width of the cycle paths is increased
- 4 respondents (<1%) recommended that the design of bus by passes be reviewed to ensure that there aren’t any conflicts with pedestrians
- 3 respondents (<1%) made positive comments about segregation for cyclists
- 1 respondent (<1%) recommended pedestrianising or removing cars where possible
- 1 respondent (<1%) said that two-way cycle tracks are not ideal
Impact on other road users: 67 comments were received about the impact of the scheme on other road users, including public transport users and drivers:

- 44 respondents (3%) said that the scheme will increase the level of congestion on the local highway network
- 10 respondents (1%) suggested that there is too much emphasis on cycling or providing improvements for cyclists
- 4 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme would create conflicts with parking or motorists
- 4 respondents (<1%) said that the proposals would cause an increase in journey times for other road users
- 2 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme will make travelling more difficult for public transport users
- 2 respondents (<1%) said that cycle facilities are rarely used by cyclists compared to the needs of other road users or that road space shouldn’t be taken away from other users
- 1 respondent (<1%) said that all road users should mix

Impact on safety: 34 comments were received concerning the impact of the scheme on safety, in general and for specific users:

- 14 respondents (1%) recommended that the safety or accessibility of the route be reviewed or improved
- 12 respondents (1%) commented that the scheme would be safer for cyclists or pedestrians
- 8 respondents (<1%) said that the scheme would be more dangerous than the existing situation

Impact on cyclists: 7 of the comments received related to the impact of the scheme on cycling or cyclists movements:

- 6 respondents (<1%) suggested that cyclists will continue to cycle on the main carriageway regardless of whether the scheme is implemented:
- 1 respondent (<1%) said that the scheme would generate an increased uptake in cycling

Impact on the environment: 6 of the comments received related to the impact of the scheme on the environment:

- 5 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme will increase or maintain pollution levels
- 1 respondent (<1%) commented that the scheme will create a better environment
**General negative comments:** 10 of the comments received provided generally negative comments about the scheme:

- 5 respondents (<1%) said that the scheme was a waste of money
- 4 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme would be too disruptive
- 1 respondent (<1%) said that the scheme was a waste of time

**Connectivity:** 4 of the comments received related impacts on connectivity as a result of the scheme:

- 3 respondents (<1%) said that the scheme would provide better cycle facilities
- 1 respondent (<1%) commented that the scheme will result in better cycle connections

**Comments about the scheme’s timescale:** One comment was received about the projected timescale, which requested that the scheme is built soon.
Section 3 – Farringdon Road and Saffron Hill (between Charterhouse Street and St Cross Street)

Overview

The North-South Cycle Superhighway route would split between Greville Street and Ray Street. Northbound cyclists would be directed onto a quiet back-street route on Saffron Hill and Herbal Hill. Southbound cyclists would remain on Farringdon Road in a segregated cycle track. The entire route would be supported by wayfinding signage and road markings.

Key Proposals

Segregated cycle lanes on Farringdon Road between Charterhouse Street and Greville Street

- Northbound and southbound cycle tracks would be at carriageway level on Farringdon Road
- The cycle lanes would be a minimum of 1.8m wide, allowing space for overtaking
- Cyclists would be separated from other traffic by a segregating island 0.3m wide
- The carriageway would be narrowed to create space for the cycle tracks, but with no net loss of traffic lanes.

Southbound stepped cycle track replaces one southbound bus lane on Farringdon Road

- The raised cycle tracks would be between footway and carriageway level on the eastern side of Farringdon Road
- The track would be 2.5m wide allowing space for overtaking
- There is insufficient width available for bus stop bypasses, so the segregation would be broken for the bus stops to allow buses to access the kerb and cyclists to go around. Only the route 63 runs along this section of Farringdon Road.

Northbound Quietway back-street route on Saffron Hill; Traffic restrictions on Greville Street, Kirby Street and St Cross Street

- Greville Street would be closed to motor traffic between Saffron Hill and Farringdon Road with a new 2m wide segregated cycle lane for northbound cyclists connecting to Saffron Hill
- Greville Street would be for access only for traffic at Kirby Street to reduce through traffic on Saffron Hill
- Kirby Street converted to one way northbound for traffic to reduce the number of vehicles using Saffron Hill
- St Cross Street converted to one way eastbound between Kirby Street and Saffron Hill to allow traffic to access Farringdon Road from Kirby Street
- Junction priorities changed at Saffron Hill with St Cross Street giving priority to northbound cyclists.

Changes to parking and loading restrictions

- All single red lines would be replaced by double red lines (no stopping at any time)
- Single yellow lines would be replaced by double yellow lines (no parking / waiting at any time) on Greville Street between Saffron Hill and Kirby Street
- Single yellow lines would be replaced by double yellow lines with double blips (no waiting / loading at any time) on Saffron Hill to maintain space for northbound cyclists during peak times. In areas of high frequency loading (at numbers 32-38, 44, 104-105 and 125 Saffron Hill), double yellow lines with single blips (loading at off peak times only) would be maintained to allow loading off peak
• Motorcycle and parking bays on the east side of Kirby Street would be relocated to the west side and replaced with double yellow lines with double blips (no waiting / loading at any time) to allow sufficient space for larger vehicles. No net loss to parking

• New loading bay proposed on south side of Greville Street.

Pedestrian improvements

• Footways widened on Greville Street to make more space for pedestrians

• Greville Street and Cowcross Street would be closed to motor traffic and the junction would be converted to a wide to toucan crossing for pedestrians and cyclists. The traffic lanes approaching the crossing would be raised to footway level to reduce the speed of vehicles at the crossing

• Footways widened on the east side of Kirby Street

• Entry to disused vehicle access points on Kirby Street at the eastern side of Farringdon Road would be raised to footway level to provide a continuous level footway for pedestrians and encourage vehicles to slow down when entering or exiting.

Urban realm improvements

• Reduced street clutter

• Additional tree planting, seating and cycle stands on Greville Street

• Improved footway materials on Greville Street to match footway outside Farringdon station.

Temporary arrangements during Crossrail construction

• The carriageway space will be limited by the construction hoardings on Farringdon Road between Charterhouse Street and Greville Street. During this period, northbound cyclists would continue as they do currently in a wide traffic lane while southbound cyclists would have a semi-segregated lane separated from traffic by vertical wands.

Route design: 131 of the comments received commented on the proposed design of the route, or provided alternative recommendations:

• 25 respondents (2%) suggested that a two-way cycle track was preferable
  ▪ 6 respondents (<1%) made general comments about a preference for a two-way cycle track
  ▪ 6 respondents (<1%) recommended making Greville Street two-way
- 6 respondents (<1%) suggested that the two-way tracks should continue on Farringdon Road
- 3 respondents (<1%) recommended making Farrington Road two-way up to Greville Street
- 2 respondents (<1%) commented that both Farringdon Road and Saffron Hill should be two-way
- 2 respondents (<1%) said that Saffron Hill should be two-way
- 23 respondents (2%) commented that the proposed route is indirect
- 19 respondents (1%) recommended that the design of bus by-passes be reviewed to ensure that there aren’t any conflicts with pedestrians
- 15 respondents (1%) identified that there could be conflicts between cyclists and buses on the Farringdon Road, with:
  - 15 respondents (1%) suggested that more segregation was needed
    - 11 respondents (1%) provided general comments about the need for increased segregation
    - 3 respondents (<1%) recommended providing fully segregated lanes on Farringdon Road
    - 1 respondent (<1%) commented that greater separation was needed from buses
- 11 respondents (1%) said that back streets are not suitable for the route or for a Cycle Superhighway
  - 6 respondents (<1%) provided general comments about the unsuitability of backstreets
  - 3 respondents (<1%) stated that Saffron Hill and / or Herbal Hill were not suitable or didn’t have sufficient capacity to accommodate a Cycle Superhighway
  - 2 respondents (<1%) objected the use of Saffron Hill due to a high number of residential properties being located there
- 8 respondents (1%) commented that the cycle routes are too narrow or that a wider cycle path should be provided
- 7 respondents (1%) recommended removing vehicles or road space where possible
- 5 respondents (<1%) suggested that improved cycle facilities or cycle route conditions are required
- 2 respondents (<1%) stated a preference for bus stop bypasses
- 2 respondents (<1%) made positive comments about segregation for cyclists
• 1 respondent (<1%) said that cycle facility improvements were positive

**Junction and crossing design:** 14 of the comments received related to the design of crossings or junctions included in the scheme:

- 5 respondents (<1%) provided general comments
- 3 respondents (<1%) commented that cyclists and pedestrians should be separated at the toucan crossing
- 1 respondent (<1%) said that cyclists shouldn’t be allowed to use the toucan crossings due to likely congestion at busy periods
- 1 respondent (<1%) suggested that access to Greville Street for cyclists travelling southbound on Farringdon Road should be provided at the crossroads
- 1 respondent (<1%) recommended that a straight ahead movement was provided from Cowcross Street to Greville Street
- 1 respondent (<1%) suggested that a pedestrian crossing should be provided at the Greville Street / Saffron Hill junction
- 1 respondent (<1%) said to ensure that cyclists can turn left onto Farringdon Road southbound at the Clerkenwell Road junction
- 1 respondent (<1%) recommended that controlled pedestrian crossings are provided at every intersection

**Impact on other road users:** 58 comments were received about the impact of the scheme on other road users, including public transport users and drivers:

- 21 respondents (1%) said that the scheme will increase the level of congestion on the local highway network
- 8 respondents (1%) stated that road space should not be cut
- 8 respondents (1%) suggested that there is too much emphasis on cycling or providing improvements for cyclists
- 7 respondents (1%) commented that the scheme will make travelling more difficult for public transport users or for vehicles servicing the route
- 6 respondents (<1%) said that the proposals would cause an increase in journey times for other road users
- 3 respondents (<1%) said that cycle facilities are rarely used by cyclists compared to the needs of other road users
- 2 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme would create conflicts with parking or motorists
- 1 respondent (<1%) said that all road users should mix
- 1 respondent (<1%) suggested that the scheme will improve traffic flow
1 respondent (<1%) commented that the removal of traffic from the route is positive

**Impact on safety:** 21 comments were received concerning the impact of the scheme on safety, in general and for specific users:

- 9 respondents (1%) said that the scheme would be more dangerous than the existing situation
- 9 respondents (1%) commented that the scheme would be safer for cyclists or pedestrians
- 3 respondents (<1%) recommended that the safety or accessibility of the route be reviewed or improved

**Impact on cyclists:** 10 of the comments received related to the impact of the scheme on cycling or cyclists movements:

- 9 respondents (1%) suggested that cyclists will continue to cycle on the main carriageway regardless of whether the scheme is implemented:
- 1 respondent (<1%) said that the scheme would generate an increased uptake in cycling

**Impact on the environment:** 5 of the comments received related to the impact of the scheme on the environment:

- 4 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme will increase pollution levels
- 1 respondent (<1%) commented that the scheme will create a better environment

**General negative comments:** 8 of the comments received provided generally negative comments about the scheme:

- 4 respondents (<1%) said that the scheme was a waste of money
- 4 respondents (<1%) said that the scheme was a waste of time

**Comments about the scheme's timescale:** One comment was received about the projected timescale, which requested that the scheme is built soon.
The North-South Cycle Superhighway route would split between Greville Street and Ray Street. Northbound cyclists would be directed onto a quiet back-street route on Saffron Hill and Herbal Hill. Southbound cyclists would remain on Farringdon Road in a segregated cycle track. The entire route would be supported by wayfinding signage and road markings.

Key Proposals

Southbound raised cycle track replaces southbound bus lane on Farringdon Road

- The raised cycle tracks would be between footway and carriageway level on the eastern side of Farringdon Road
- The track would be 2.5m wide, allowing space for overtaking
- Early releases for cyclists at all arms at Clerkenwell Road junction
- Footway narrowed on Clerkenwell Road east of Farringdon Road to original width and consistent with other footways. This allows space for mandatory cycle lane on exit from the junction
• There is insufficient width available for bus stop bypasses, so the segregation would be broken for the bus stops to allow buses to access the kerb and cyclists to go around. Only the route 63 runs along this section of Farringdon Road.

Northbound Quietway back-street route on Saffron Hill and Herbal Hill

• Herbal Hill would be raised to footway level throughout to balance space for pedestrians and cyclists

• Carriageway would be a uniform width of 2.5m and footways provided in a contrasting colour and material

• Bollards would protect buildings and basements from being overrun by motor traffic.

Signalised junction on Clerkenwell Road with Saffron Hill and Herbal Hill

• New signalised junction at Clerkenwell Road with Saffron Hill to assist cyclists crossing Clerkenwell Road

• Early releases for cyclists on all arms

• New mandatory cycle lanes on Clerkenwell Road

• Junction raised to footway level to provide level surface for pedestrians and reduce vehicle speeds.

Changes to parking and loading restrictions

• Parking and loading bays on the eastern side of Farringdon Road would be removed. Kerbside surveys show that these are not well used

• The loading and disabled bay on the western side of Farringdon Road, north of the Clerkenwell Road junction would be reduced in length by 16m to accommodate the relocated bus stop

• Parking and loading bays on west side of Farringdon Road, south of Clerkenwell Road would be maintained

• Single yellow lines would be replaced with double yellow lines with double blips (no loading at any time) on Clerkenwell Road on approach to the junction of Saffron and Herbal Hill

• Single yellow lines would be replaced with double yellow lines (no parking / waiting at any time) on Clerkenwell Road on approach to the Farringdon Road junction

• Single yellow lines would be replaced by double yellow lines with double blips (no waiting / loading at any time) on Saffron Hill and Herbal Hill to maintain
space for northbound cyclists during peak times. Full video surveys have been conducted to determine areas of high frequency loading. At these locations (at numbers 55-59 and 67-74 Saffron Hill and 10 Herbal Hill), double yellow lines with single blips (loading only at off peak times) would be provided to allow loading off peak.

Banned left turn onto Farringdon Road (north) from Clerkenwell Road (west) and onto Clerkenwell Road (east) from Farringdon Road (north) for all traffic except cyclists

- Banned left turn for eastbound vehicles onto Farringdon Road (north) and conversion of the left turn slip lane to cycle only. Our latest traffic counts show that a maximum of 66 vehicles per hour make this movement. Alternative nearby routes are available

- Banned left turn for southbound vehicles onto Clerkenwell Road (east). Our latest traffic counts show that a maximum of 45 vehicles per hour make this turn. Alternative nearby routes are available.

Early release for cyclists

- Early release signals would be provided for cyclists on Saffron Hill, Farringdon Road and all arms of Clerkenwell Road.

‘Two-stage’ right turn

- A ‘two-stage turn’ for cyclists would be provided for cyclists travelling all directions at the junction with Clerkenwell Road.

Improved pedestrian facilities

- Signalised crossings widened on all arms of Clerkenwell Road junction with Farringdon Road

- Footway would be widened at the northwest corner of the junction with Clerkenwell Road and would include a new left turn cycle only slip lane from Clerkenwell Road (west) to Farringdon Road (north)

- New signalised pedestrian crossing to replace existing zebra crossing on Clerkenwell Road near Saffron Hill

- Clerkenwell Road junction with Saffron Hill would be raised to footway level to provide a level crossing point for pedestrians and to slow vehicles through the junction.

Relocation of bus stops

- The northbound (C, Clerkenwell Road) and southbound (H, Clerkenwell Road) bus stops on the approaches to the junction between Farringdon Road
and Clerkenwell Road would be relocated to the exits of the junction. This would make it easier for cyclists to get to the front of waiting traffic and also improve the junction operation for other vehicles. Bus route 63 serves these two stops

- The eastbound bus stop (E, Hatton Garden) on the approach to the junction between Clerkenwell Road and Saffron Hill would be relocated to the exit of the junction. Bus routes 55, 243 and N35 serve this stop.

**Route design:** 113 of the comments received commented on the proposed design of the route, or provided alternative recommendations:

- 18 respondents (1%) commented that bus stops should be removed from the cycle lanes
- 14 respondents (1%) said that more segregation was needed
  - 9 respondents (<1%) provided general comments about the need for more segregation
  - 2 respondents (<1%) suggested improved segregation was required along the whole route
  - 1 respondent (<1%) recommended providing increased segregation on Clerkenwell Road
  - 1 respondent (<1%) said additional segregation was needed on Saffron Road
  - 1 respondent (<1%) stated that the southbound section of Farringdon Road should be segregated
- 14 respondents (1%) suggested that a two-way cycle track was preferable
  - 7 respondents (<1%) said two-way tracks should be provided on Saffron Hill
  - 7 respondents (<1%) suggested providing two-way tracks on Herbal Hill
  - 3 respondents (<1%) commented that two-way tracks were needed on Farringdon Road
  - 1 respondent (<1%) recommended providing a two-way track on Greville Street
  - 1 respondent (<1%) provided general comments about providing two-way tracks
- 12 respondents (1%) said that back streets are not suitable for the route or for a Cycle Superhighway
- 8 respondents (<1%) provided general comments about the unsuitability of back streets
- 10 respondents (<1%) suggested that Saffron Hill was unsuitable for a Cycle Superhighway route
- 2 respondents (<1%) commented that Herbal Hill was unsuitable

- 11 respondents (1%) stated that the route should not be split or that the diversion is not suitable
- 17 respondents (1%) recommended removing vehicles or closing road space where possible
- 10 respondents (1%) suggested the siting of bus stops needs to be carefully considered to ensure the safety of pedestrians and cyclists
- 5 respondents (<1%) proposed that bus stop bypasses should be introduced
- 4 respondents (<1%) suggested that vehicle space should not be cut
- 3 respondents (<1%) commented that the route is indirect
- 3 respondents (<1%) suggested that additional cycle facilities are required
- 1 respondent (<1%) said that the non-mandatory cycle lane on Clerkenwell Road is dangerous and should be removed
- 1 respondent (<1%) made a positive comment about segregation for cyclists

**Junction and crossing design:** 32 of the comments received related to the design of crossings or junctions included in the scheme:

- Clerkenwell Rd junction
  - 3 respondents (<1%) recommended improving the waiting area for cyclists waiting to turn right at the Clerkenwell Road junction
  - 3 respondents (<1%) opposed the banned left turn into Clerkenwell Road east with one recommending that it is replaced with an ASL
  - 2 respondents (<1%) commented that there are hook risks at the Clerkenwell Road junction
  - 2 respondents (<1%) stated that the plans should be changed to allow left turns onto Farringdon Road southbound from Clerkenwell Road
  - 2 respondents (<1%) oppose the early release at the Clerkenwell Road junction
  - 1 respondent (<1%) recommended reviewing the traffic light phasing at the Clerkenwell Road junction
  - 2 respondents (<1%) made general comments about the Clerkenwell Road junction
• 1 respondent (<1%) opposes the signalisation of the Clerkenwell Road / Saffron Hill / Herbal Hill junction due to the delay it will cause on Clerkenwell Road

• Pedestrian crossings:
  • 7 respondents (1%) commented that crossings in general, or a specific crossing, required improvement:
  • 2 respondents (<1%) oppose the removal of the zebra crossing on Clerkenwell Road
  • 2 respondents (<1%) suggested reviewing the signal timings of the crossing on Clerkenwell Road
  • 1 respondent (<1%) expressed concern about informal crossings
  • 1 respondent (<1%) queried how crossings would be enforced
  • 1 respondent (<1%) suggested reviewing the crossing proposal on Saffron Hill

• Other
  • 5 respondents (<1%) said that two-stage right turns are not ideal
  • 2 respondents (<1%) stated that filtered permeability is required to limit through traffic on quiet roads
  • 2 respondents (<1%) suggested that early release at junctions is a good idea
  • 1 respondent (<1%) provided positive comments about two-stage right turns

**Impact on other road users:** 49 comments were received about the impact of the scheme on other road users, including public transport users and drivers:

• 20 respondents (1%) said that the scheme will increase the level of congestion on the local highway network

• 8 respondents (1%) commented that the scheme will make travelling more difficult for public transport users or local residents

• 8 respondents (1%) commented that the scheme would create conflicts with parking or motorists

• 7 respondents (<1%) suggested that there is too much emphasis on cycling or providing improvements for cyclists

• 4 respondents (<1%) said that the proposals would cause an increase in journey times for other road users

• 1 respondent (<1%) said that all road users should mix
• 1 respondent (<1%) said that there is the potential for conflicts with pedestrians

**Impact on safety:** 21 comments were received concerning the impact of the scheme on safety, in general and for specific users:

• 10 respondents (1%) said that the scheme would be more dangerous than the existing situation
• 6 respondents (<1%) recommended that the safety or accessibility of the route be reviewed or improved
• 5 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme would be safer for cyclists or pedestrians

**Impact on cyclists:** 10 of the comments received related to the impact of the scheme on cycling or cyclists movements:

• 8 respondents (1%) suggested that cyclists will continue to cycle on the main carriageway regardless of whether the scheme is implemented:
• 1 respondent (<1%) commented that only a limited number of cyclists will use the proposed route
• 1 respondent (<1%) said that the scheme would generate an increased uptake in cycling

**Impact on the environment:** 5 of the comments received related to the impact of the scheme on the environment:

• 4 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme will increase pollution levels
• 1 respondent (<1%) commented that the scheme will create a better environment

**General negative comments:** 11 of the comments received provided generally negative comments about the scheme:

• 6 respondents (<1%) said that the scheme was a waste of money
• 2 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme would be too disruptive
• 2 respondents (<1%) said that the scheme was a waste of time

**Comments about the scheme’s timescale:** One comment was received about the projected timescale, which requested that the scheme is built soon.
Section 5 – Farringdon Road, Ray Street, Herbal Hill and Warner Street

Overview

At Ray Street, the North-South Cycle Superhighway continues on quiet back-streets to King’s Cross.

Key Proposals

Junction between Farringdon Road, Ray Street and Ray Street Bridge signalised to improve safety and allow southbound cyclists to access the cycle track from Ray Street

- Signalised pedestrian crossing at Farringdon Lane would be relocated south and incorporated into a new signalised junction
- Ray Street would be converted to one-way westbound for traffic with a contraflow cycle lane for cyclists heading south on the North-South Cycle Superhighway. Alternative route via Warner Street and Baker’s Row.
- 24hr mandatory cycle lanes north of the junction
- Ray Street Bridge and Farringdon Lane one-way directions would be reversed to one-way eastbound on Ray Street Bridge and one-way northbound on Farringdon Lane to simplify the new junction. A contra-flow cycle lane would
be provided on Ray Street Bridge. Alternative route onto Farringdon Road via Farringdon Lane.

Southbound raised cycle track replaces southbound bus lane on Farringdon Road

- The raised cycle tracks would be between footway and carriageway level on the eastern side of Farringdon Road
- The track would be 2.5m wide allowing space for overtaking.

Northbound and southbound back–street route on Ray Street and Warner Street

- Round top road humps on Warner Street would be removed and replaced with raised tables to improve comfort for cyclists.

Changes to parking and loading restrictions

- All single red lines would be replaced by double red lines (no stopping at any time)
- Single yellow lines replaced with double yellow lines (no parking / waiting at any time) on the north side of Ray Street where new 24hr mandatory cycle lane is proposed
- Parking bay on the southern side of Ray Street would be reduced in length by 1m at the eastern end and to allow large vehicles to turn into Ray Street from Farringdon Road – no net loss in parking bays
- Removal of two mixed use parking bays on western end of Ray Street
- Trader parking bay on Ray Street west of Herbal Hill to be relocated north-west on Warner Street replacing underutilised pay and display parking bay
- Parking bays on the corner of Warner Street to be relocated west to improve vehicle sightlines
- Single yellow lines replaced with double yellow lines with double blips (no waiting / loading at any time) at the eastern end of Warner Street to improve sightlines where the road bends. In areas of high frequency loading (at number 28 Warner Street), double yellow line with single blips (loading only at off peak times) would be provided to allow loading off peak.

Pedestrian improvements

- Three new signalised pedestrian crossings would be introduced across Ray Street and Ray Street Bridge at the junction with Farringdon Road
- Footways widened on Ray Street / Warner Street to reduce vehicles speeds and create more space for pedestrians
Route design: 81 of the comments received commented on the proposed design of the route, or provided alternative recommendations:

- 21 respondents (2%) said that more segregation was needed
  - 12 respondents (1%) provided general comments about improving the level of segregation along the route
  - 7 respondents (<1%) referenced Farringdon Road
  - 1 respondent (<1%) mentioned Ray Street
  - 1 respondent (<1%) commented on Herbal Hill
  - 1 respondent (<1%) referenced Warner Street
- 16 respondents (1%) recommended removing vehicles or closing road space where possible
- 8 respondents (1%) stated that the route should not be split or that the diversion is not suitable
- 7 respondents (1%) provided general comments that back streets are not suitable for the route or for a Cycle Superhighway
- 6 respondents (<1%) suggested that vehicle space should not be cut
- 6 respondents (<1%) suggested that a two-way cycle track was preferable
  - 4 respondents (<1%) referenced Herbal Hill
  - 2 respondents (<1%) referenced Farringdon Road
  - 1 respondent (<1%) referenced Saffron Hill
  - 1 respondent (<1%) referenced Warner Street
  - 1 respondent (<1%) referenced Ray Bridge Street
- 4 respondents (<1%) suggested that additional cycle facilities are required
- 3 respondents (<1%) stated a preference for a stepped cycle track
- 2 respondents (<1%) recommended extending the proposed route along Farringdon Road
- 2 respondents (<1%) recommended that the design of bus by passes be reviewed to ensure that there aren’t any conflicts with pedestrians
- 5 respondents (<1%) proposed that bus stop bypasses should be introduced
- 3 respondents (<1%) commented that the route is indirect
- 1 respondent (<1%) commended the use of quiet and back streets
- 1 respondent (<1%) made a positive comment about segregation for cyclists.

**Junction and crossing design:** 18 of the comments received related to the design of crossings or junctions included in the scheme:

- 11 respondents (1%) stated that junctions in general, or a specific junction, required improvement
  - 8 (<1%) respondents suggested that the design of Ray Street should be reviewed
  - 1 (<1%) respondent recommended replacing banned turns with ASLs
  - 1 (<1%) respondent said that there is a left hook risk at the Ray Street, Farringdon Road, Herbal Hill and Warner Street junctions
  - 1 (<1%) respondent commented that the design for the Clerkenwell Road junction should be reviewed
- 6 respondents (<1%) commented that crossings in general, or a specific crossing, required improvement
  - 1 (<1%) respondent provided general comments about crossings requiring improvements
  - 2 (<1%) respondents recommended that crossings on Farringdon Road require improvement
  - 1 (<1%) respondent referenced the crossing at the junction of Ray Street and Farringdon Road
  - 1 (<1%) respondent suggested providing a zebra crossing on Ray Street
  - 1 (<1%) respondent queried how the controlled crossings would be enforced
- 1 respondent (<1%) stated that lights were required at junctions to give cyclists priority

**Impact on other road users:** 40 comments were received about the impact of the scheme on other road users, including public transport users and drivers:

- 14 respondents (1%) expressed concern that the scheme will increase congestion
- 11 respondents (1%) suggested that there is too much emphasis on cycling or providing improvements for cyclists
- 4 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme will make travelling more difficult for public transport users or local residents
• 2 respondents (<1%) said that there is the potential for conflicts with pedestrians
• 2 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme would create conflicts with parking or vehicles waiting or loading
• 2 respondents (<1%) said that all road users should mix
• 2 respondents (<1%) suggested that cycle facilities are rarely used compared to facilities for other road users
• 2 respondents (<1%) said that the proposals would cause an increase in journey times for other road users
• 1 respondent (<1%) commented that the scheme will improve traffic flow on the local highway network

Impact on safety: 21 comments were received concerning the impact of the scheme on safety, in general and for specific users:

• 10 respondents (1%) said that the scheme would be more dangerous than the existing situation
• 6 respondents (<1%) recommended that the safety or accessibility of the route be reviewed or improved
• 5 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme would be safer for cyclists or pedestrians

Impact on cyclists: 7 of the comments received related to the impact of the scheme on cycling or cyclists movements:

• 6 respondents (<1%) suggested that cyclists will continue to cycle on the main carriageway regardless of whether the scheme is implemented:
• 1 respondent (<1%) said that the scheme would generate an increased uptake in cycling

Impact on the environment: 5 of the comments received related to the impact of the scheme on the environment:

• 4 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme will increase pollution levels
• 1 respondent (<1%) commented that the scheme will create a better environment

General negative comments: 13 of the comments received provided generally negative comments about the scheme:

• 7 respondents (1%) said that the scheme was a waste of money
• 5 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme would be too disruptive
• 2 respondents (<1%) said that the scheme was a waste of time

Comments about the scheme's timescale: One comment was received about the projected timescale, which requested that the scheme is built soon.
Section 6 – Warner Street and Phoenix Place

Overview

At Ray Street, the North-South Cycle Superhighway continues on quiet back-streets to King’s Cross.

Key Proposals

- Quiet back-street route on Phoenix Place and Warner Street
  - Quiet back-street route for northbound and southbound cyclists along Phoenix Place and Warner Street to connect to Ray Street and Herbal Hill where northbound and southbound routes split
  - Speed cushions and round top speed humps would be removed and replaced with new flat topped raised tables to improve comfort for cyclists and reduce vehicle speeds
  - Change in priority of junction with Mount Pleasant to give priority to the North-South route for cyclists
  - Resurfacing on Warner Street to improve carriageway surface for cyclists.
Changes to parking and loading restrictions

- Parking on Phoenix Place relocated north to allow space for new raised table. No net loss in parking
- Remainder of parking maintained.

Pedestrian improvements

- Disused vehicle crossovers on Phoenix Place converted to footway

**Route design:** 58 of the comments received commented on the proposed design of the route, or provided alternative recommendations:

- 29 respondents (2%) said that more segregation was needed
  - 21 respondents (2%) provided general comments about improving the level of segregation along the route
  - 2 respondents (<1%) referenced Farringdon Road
  - 2 respondents (<1%) commented on Phoenix Place
  - 2 respondents (<1%) referenced Warner Street
- 5 respondents (<1%) recommended providing increased traffic calming
  - 2 (<1%) respondents provided general comments about the need for increased traffic calming
  - 2 (<1%) respondents referenced Mount Pleasant
  - 1 (<1%) respondent mentioned Ray Street
- 7 respondents (1%) commented that lower speed bumps on the route should be provided or that alternative traffic calming measures should be considered
- 5 respondents (<1%) said that back streets are not suitable for the route or for a Cycle Superhighway
- 3 respondents (<1%) stated a preference for a more direct route
- 2 respondents (<1%) made a positive comment about segregation for cyclists
- 1 respondent (1%) recommended removing vehicles or closing road space where possible
- 1 respondent (<1%) suggested that there should be more equal use of road space between all users

**Junction and crossing design:** 3 of the comments received related to the design of crossings or junctions included in the scheme:
• 3 respondents (<1%) stated that junctions in general, or a specific junction, required improvement
  ▪ 2 respondents (<1%) provided general comments on the need to improve junctions
  ▪ 1 respondent (<1%) suggested replacing banned turns with ASLs

**Impact on other road users:** 21 comments were received about the impact of the scheme on other road users, including public transport users and drivers:

• 15 respondents (1%) expressed concern that the scheme will increase congestion
• 4 respondents (<1%) said that the proposals would cause an increase in journey times for other road users
• 1 respondent (<1%) said that all road users should mix
• 1 respondent (<1%) commented that the scheme will ease congestion on the local highway network

**Impact on safety:** 19 comments were received concerning the impact of the scheme on safety, in general and for specific users:

• 14 respondents (1%) recommended that the safety or accessibility of the route be reviewed or improved
• 5 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme would be safer for cyclists or pedestrians

**Impact on cyclists:** 8 of the comments received related to the impact of the scheme on cycling or cyclists movements:

• 8 respondents (1%) suggested that cyclists will continue to cycle on the main carriageway regardless of whether the scheme is implemented:

**General negative comments:** 8 of the comments received provided generally negative comments about the scheme:

• 3 respondents (<1%) said that the scheme was a waste of money
• 4 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme would be too disruptive
• 2 respondents (<1%) said that the scheme was a waste of time

**Comments about the scheme's timescale:** One comment was received about the projected timescale, which requested that the scheme is built soon.
Section 7 – Pakenham Street, Calthorpe Street and Cubitt Street

Overview

At Ray Street, the North-South Cycle Superhighway continues on quiet back-streets to King’s Cross.

Key Proposals

Quiet back-street route on Packenham Street and Cubitt Street; Packenham Street closed to motor traffic between Calthorpe Street and Wren Street

- Quiet back-street route for northbound and southbound cyclists along Packenham Street and Cubitt Street

- Packenham Street closed to motor traffic between Calthorpe Street and Wren Street to provide new two way cycle only lane. Access is retained by using alternatives routes on Frederick Street, Cubitt Street, Wren Street, Roseberry Avenue and Mount Pleasant

- Existing width restriction on Calthorpe Street would be reconstructed

- Round top road humps would be removed to improve comfort for cyclists

- Calthorpe Street / Phoenix Place junction and Cubitt Street / Ampton Street would be raised to footway level to reduce vehicle speeds
- New mandatory cycle lane provided on north side of Calthorpe Street connecting cyclists to Farringdon Road

- Priorities changes at Packenham Street / Cubitt Street in favour of the North-South Cycle Superhighway route.

Changes to parking and loading restrictions

- Single yellow line converted to double yellow line on Calthorpe Street, Phoenix Place and at the junction of Packenham Street / Cubitt Street to prevent parking on corners

- Existing coach bay on north side of Calthorpe Street raised to footway level to create more space for pedestrians when vacant.

Pedestrian and urban realm improvements

- Footways widened at junction of Packenham Street / Phoenix Place and Calthorpe Street and at Cubitt Street to create more space for pedestrians. Camden Council is seeking suggestions for further public realm improvements at this location

- Existing informal pedestrian crossing to be converted to a new zebra crossing
Junction raised to footway level to provide level crossing surfaces and to slow vehicles speeds

New cycle parking.

**Route design:** 48 of the comments received commented on the proposed design of the route, or provided alternative recommendations:

- 32 respondents (2%) said that more segregation was needed or that the route should be extended or widened
  - 20 respondents (1%) provided general comments about improving the level of segregation along the route
  - 4 respondents (<1%) said that more segregation was needed on Farringdon Road
  - 6 respondents (<1%) provided general comments about widening the route
  - 1 respondent (<1%) recommended widening Cubitt Street to Ampton Place
  - 1 respondent (<1%) suggested that the route should be extended to York Way and Caledonian Road
- 8 respondents (<1%) recommended removing vehicles or closing road space where possible
- 7 respondents (<1%) recommended that the Cycle Superhighway should have priority over the roads that it crosses
- 3 respondents (<1%) said that back streets are not suitable for the route or for a Cycle Superhighway
- 1 respondent (<1%) commented that adequate signage will be required to ensure the coherence of the route
- 1 respondent (<1%) said that the route should be straightened or made more direct

**Junction and crossing design:** 24 of the comments received related to the design of crossings or junctions included in the scheme:

- 12 respondents (1%) stated that junctions in general, or a specific junction, required improvement
  - 5 respondents suggested reviewing the priorities at the Calthorpe Street / Phoenix Place junction
  - 2 respondents commented on the sharp turns at the Pakenham Street / Calthorpe Street junction
- 2 respondents said that the Pakenham Street / Wren Street junction priorities were bad or dangerous
- 1 respondent recommended reviewing the Cubitt Street junction priorities
- 1 respondent suggested replacing banned turns with ASLs
- 1 respondent provided general comments on improving junctions

- 3 respondents (<1%) commented that crossings in general, or a specific crossing, required improvement
  - 1 respondent made general comments about increasing the provision of crossings for pedestrians
  - 1 respondent stated that the zebra crossing on Calthorpe Street should only be for cyclists
  - 1 respondent suggested moving the pedestrian crossing on Calthorpe Street closer to the junction with Phoenix Place to allow easier crossing by cyclists

- 6 respondents (<1%) suggested that new crossings were required or more suitable crossings

**Impact on safety:** 34 comments were received concerning the impact of the scheme on safety, in general and for specific users:

- 29 respondents (2%) recommended that the safety or accessibility of the route be reviewed or improved
- 4 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme would be safer for cyclists or pedestrians
- 1 respondent (<1%) expressed concern about the number of construction vehicles for surrounding developments and potential conflicts with cyclists

**Impact on other road users:** 26 comments were received about the impact of the scheme on other road users, including public transport users and drivers:

- 18 respondents (1%) expressed concern that the scheme will increase congestion
- 6 respondents (<1%) said that the proposals would cause an increase in journey times for other road users
- 1 respondent (<1%) said that there should be greater equality for all road users, with less emphasis on cyclists
- 1 respondent (<1%) commented that the scheme will improve traffic flow on the local highway network
Impact on cyclists: 9 of the comments received related to the impact of the scheme on cycling or cyclists movements:

- 7 respondents (<1%) suggested that cyclists will continue to cycle on the main carriageway regardless of whether the scheme is implemented:
- 2 respondents (<1%) said that the scheme would generate an increased uptake in cycling

Impact on the environment: One comment was received that related to the impact of the scheme on the environment, which stated that the scheme would create a better environment with less pollution.

General negative comments: 12 of the comments received provided generally negative comments about the scheme:

- 4 respondents (<1%) said that the scheme was a waste of money
- 7 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme would be too disruptive
- 2 respondents (<1%) said that the scheme was a waste of time

Comments about the scheme’s timescale: One comment was received about the projected timescale, which requested that the scheme is built soon.
Section 8 – Ampton Street, Sidmouth Street and Tavistock Place

Overview

At Ray Street, the North-South Cycle Superhighway continues on quiet back-streets to King’s Cross.

Key Proposals

Quiet back-street route on Sidmouth Street and Tavistock Place

- Cycle hire docking points modified to accommodate widening of cycle only facility at western end of Ampton Street

- Existing width restriction between Seaford Street and Regent Square reconstructed to include informal pedestrian crossing point and new cycle bypasses either side. Priority for eastbound traffic and access retained for emergency vehicles with droppable bollards.

Changes to parking and loading restrictions

- Parking bay on Ampton Street reduced by 3m with no net loss to the number of parking bays

- Existing parking bays on Regent Square would be built-up to footway level to provide more space for pedestrians when they are not in use
• Single yellow line replaced with double yellow lines with double blips (no waiting / loading at any time) at eastern end of Sidmouth Street on approach to the junction with Gray’s Inn Road to keep junction clear for cyclists

• Double yellow line replaced with double yellow lines with double blips (no waiting / loading at any time) on Sidmouth Street between Seaford Street and Regent Square to prevent vehicles blocking width restriction

• Single yellow lines replaced with double yellow lines (no parking / waiting at any time) on Tavistock Place between Regent Square and Wakefield Street.

Gray’s Inn Road junction with Sidmouth Street

• Early release for cyclists on Sidmouth Street to allow cyclists to progress through the junction ahead of motor traffic

• Existing cycle only facility on Ampton Street widened to accommodate increase in cycle flows

• Future improvements on Gray’s Inn Road to be proposed by Camden Council – not part of this consultation.

Early release for cyclists

• Early release signals would be provided for cyclists on Sidmouth Street.

Pedestrian and urban realm improvements

• Footways de-cluttered by removing bollards and pedestrian guard rail at width restriction

• Existing pedestrian refuge islands removed and footways widened on Tavistock Place

• New cycle parking at western end of Ampton Street

• Existing parking bays on Regent Square raised to footway level to increase space for pedestrians when bays are vacant

• Footway widening on Tavistock Place.

**Route design:** 77 of the comments received commented on the proposed design of the route, or provided alternative recommendations:

• 52 respondents (4%) said that more segregation was needed or that the route should be straightened or widened
  • 25 respondents provided general comments about improving the level of segregation along the route
• 3 respondents said that more segregation was needed on Farringdon Road
• 2 respondents recommended increasing the level of segregation on Ampton Street
• 2 respondents said that Sidmouth Street should be segregated
• 1 respondent commented that Tavistock Place should have more segregation for cyclists
• 4 respondents provided general comments about widening the route
• 9 respondents said that Ampton Street should be widened
• 3 respondents provided general comments about straightening the route.

• 9 respondents (<1%) commented that the route is indirect
• 8 respondents (<1%) recommended removing vehicles or closing road space where possible
• 3 respondents (<1%) made a positive comment about segregation for cyclists
• 2 respondents (<1%) said that back streets are not suitable for the route or for a Cycle Superhighway
• 2 respondents (<1%) recommended reviewing the proposed traffic calming measures
• 1 respondent (<1%) proposed an alternative terminus for the route of the Gray’s Inn Road / Euston Road junction

**Junction and crossing design:** 23 of the comments received related to the design of crossings or junctions included in the scheme:

• 10 respondents (1%) stated that junctions in general, or a specific junction, required improvement
  • 3 respondents commented that the early release at the junction with Gray’s Inn Road is unsafe
  • 2 respondents recommended reviewing the junction between Ampton Street and Sidmouth Street / Regents Square
  • 1 respondent suggested that the junction from Tavistock Place to Judd Street needs to be reviewed
  • 1 respondent requested that banned turns be replaced by ASLs
  • 1 respondent required further clarity on how to access King’s Cross using the route
- 2 respondents provided general comments about improvements to junctions
- 5 respondents (<1%) suggested that new crossings were required or that improvements should be made to existing or proposed crossings
  - 2 respondents suggested that the provision of informal crossings is reviewed
  - 1 respondent recommended providing a zebra crossing
  - 1 respondent expressed concerns about older people crossing the road
  - 1 respondent suggested that pedestrian crossings should be provided at bus stop bypasses
  - 1 respondent provided general comments about the need to improve crossings
- 2 respondents (<1%) provided positive comments about early release for cyclists
- 1 respondent (<1%) provided a negative comment about early release for cyclists

**Impact on safety:** 29 comments were received concerning the impact of the scheme on safety, in general and for specific users:
- 23 respondents (2%) recommended that the safety or accessibility of the route be reviewed or improved
- 6 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme would be safer for cyclists or pedestrians

**Impact on other road users:** 28 comments were received about the impact of the scheme on other road users, including public transport users and drivers:
- 17 respondents (1%) expressed concern that the scheme will increase congestion
- 8 respondents (1%) said that the proposals would cause an increase in journey times for other road users
- 2 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme would create conflicts with parking or vehicles waiting or loading
- 1 respondent (<1%) said that there is the potential for conflicts with pedestrians

**Impact on cyclists:** 4 of the comments received related to the impact of the scheme on cycling or cyclists movements, commenting that cyclists will continue to cycle on the main carriageway regardless of whether the scheme is implemented:
Impact on the environment: 4 comments were received that related to the impact of the scheme on the environment, which stated that the scheme would cause an increase in pollution.

General negative comments: 21 of the comments received provided generally negative comments about the scheme:

- 6 respondents (<1%) said that the scheme was a waste of money
- 9 respondents (1%) commented that the scheme would be too disruptive
- 1 respondent (<1%) said that the scheme was a waste of time
- 5 respondents (<1%) suggested that the existing route is sufficient or that it shouldn’t be altered

1 respondent (<1%) stated that the scheme would have a negative impact on the local economy.
Section 9 – Tavistock Place and Judd Street

Overview

At Ray Street, the North-South Cycle Superhighway continues on quiet back-streets to King’s Cross.

Key Proposals

Quiet back-street route on Judd Street

- Junctions with Bidborough Street and Cromer Street would be raised to footway level to provide level surface for pedestrians
- Cycle logos would be provided throughout Judd Street to highlight the presence of cyclists.

Changes to parking and loading

- Single yellow lines converted to double yellow lines (no parking / waiting at any time) on Judd Street at the junction with Bidborough Street and the junction with Cromer Street.
Pedestrian and urban realm improvements

- The existing pelican crossing on Judd Street would be replaced with a wider zebra crossing
- Junction of Judd Street with Bidborough Street raised to footway level.

Judd Street junction with Tavistock Place

- New cycle feeder lane on Judd Street southbound approach to junction
- Camden Council is currently undertaking a trial scheme at this junction – not part of this consultation. See camden.gov.uk/torringontavistocktrial for more information.

Early release for cyclists

- Early release signals would be provided for cyclists on all arms of the Tavistock Place / Judd Street junction.

Connection with Judd Street / Midland Road

- The North-South Cycle Superhighway would terminate at the top of Judd Street and would connect to Euston Road and further north on Midland Road as part of the proposed Central London Grid. For further information see separate consultation: www.wearecamden.org/culture-environment/midland.

Brunswick Square

- Camden Council is proposing changes at nearby Brunswick Square to reduce northbound traffic on Hunter Street / Judd Street and provide pedestrian, cycle and public realm improvements. For further information see separate consultation: https://consultations.wearecamden.org/culture-environment/brunswicksquare.

Design and route alignment: 237 of the comments received commented on the proposed design of the route, or provided alternative recommendations:

- 170 respondents (12%) expressed concern about the route’s alignment along Judd Street, referencing the proximity to the Royal National Institute of Blind People (RNIB) headquarters (see section 3.17 for more information)
  - 118 respondents (9%) expressed concern about the potential for accidents involving people with visual impairments to occur if the Cycle Superhighway is routed along Judd Street
  - 111 respondents (9%) expressed concern about the removal of the pelican crossing on Judd Street due to the negative impact for RNIB visitors and staff
• 55 respondents (4%) stated that the routing of the Cycle Superhighway by the RNIB facilities presented a potential danger for staff and visitors

• 20 respondents (2%) suggested that the proposal to route the Cycle Superhighway along Judd Street would have a negative impact on people with visual impairments’ independence

• 5 respondents (<1%) said that the addition of double yellow lines would make it more difficult for visitors to the RNIB facility to be dropped off by taxi

• 47 respondents (3%) said that more segregation was needed or that the route should be widened

  ▪ 30 respondents (2%) provided general comments about improving the level of segregation along the route

  ▪ 10 respondents (<1%) suggested providing increased segregation on Judd Street

  ▪ 3 respondents (<1%) recommended segregating the King’s Cross junction to allow easier access to the station

  ▪ 2 respondents (<1%) said that more segregation was needed on Farringdon Road

• 8 respondents (<1%) recommended removing vehicles or closing road space where possible

• 5 respondents (<1%) made a positive comment about segregation for cyclists

• 2 respondents (<1%) commented that the Tavistock Place pilot scheme should be retained or that the Cycle Superhighway should link to the scheme

• 2 respondents (<1%) said that back streets are not suitable for the route or for a Cycle Superhighway

• 2 respondents (<1%) proposed that the route should be extended

• 1 respondent (<1%) commented that shared space is a bad idea

**Junction and crossing design:** 20 of the comments received related to the design of crossings or junctions included in the scheme:

• 15 respondents (1%) stated that junctions in general, or a specific junction, required improvement

  ▪ 5 respondents commented that the use of early release should be reviewed

  ▪ 2 respondents said that greater protection was needed for cyclists at junctions

  ▪ 2 respondents recommended that the banned left turn from Tavistock Place to Judd Street is reinstated
1 respondent requested that banned turns be replaced by ASLs

1 respondent commented that separate cycle signals are required at junctions

1 respondent suggested that cycle priority is clearly marked at junctions

1 respondent recommended reviewing pavement levels at junctions

1 respondent said that improved pedestrian crossings should be provided

1 respondent provided general comments about improvements to junctions

- 3 respondents (<1%) commented that the pelican crossing on Judd Street should be retained but did not reference the RNIB
- 2 respondents (<1%) provided positive comments about early release or modal filtering

Impact on safety: 33 comments were received concerning the impact of the scheme on safety, in general and for specific users:

- 26 respondents (2%) recommended that the safety or accessibility of the route be reviewed or improved
- 7 respondents (<1%) commented that the scheme would be safer for cyclists or pedestrians

Impact on cyclists: 14 of the comments received related to the impact of the scheme on cycling or cyclists movements, commenting that cyclists will continue to cycle on the main carriageway regardless of whether the scheme is implemented:

Impact on other road users: 29 comments were received about the impact of the scheme on other road users, including public transport users and drivers:

- 24 respondents (2%) expressed concern that the scheme will increase congestion
- 4 respondents (<1%) said that the proposals would cause an increase in journey times for other road users
- 1 respondent (<1%) commented that the scheme would create conflicts with parking or vehicles waiting or loading

Impact on the environment: One comment was received that related to the impact of the scheme on the environment, which stated that the scheme would create a better environment with less pollution.

General negative comments: 16 of the comments received provided generally negative comments about the scheme:
• 6 respondents (<1% of all respondents) said that the scheme was a waste of money
• 8 respondents (1%) commented that the scheme would be too disruptive
• 3 respondents (<1%) said that the scheme was a waste of time
• 1 respondent (<1%) suggested that all of the road network should be modernised, not just space for cyclists
• 1 respondent (<1%) stated that the consultation for the scheme was too hurried

Petitions and campaigns
We received a response from the RNIB with individual responses supporting the RNIB’s response. 170 responses referred to the RNIB on Judd Street. Most of these used similar wording but as all these responses were personalised in some way we have treated them as individual responses and not as a campaign.
Appendix B: Consultation questions

1. Do you support our overall proposals for the continuation of the North-South Cycle Superhighway (CS6) between Stonecutter Street and King's Cross? (Required)
   Please select only one item
   - Yes
   - Partially
   - Not sure
   - No opinion
   - No

   Do you have any comments on the overall proposals?

Section 1 - Farringdon St (between Stonecutter St and Holborn Viaduct)

2. Do you support the proposals for Section 1 - Farringdon St (between Stonecutter St and Holborn Viaduct) - of the North-South Cycle Superhighway? (Required)
   Please select only one item
   - Yes
   - Partially
   - Not sure
   - No opinion
   - No

   Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 1 - Farringdon St (between Stonecutter St and Holborn Viaduct)?

Section 2 - Farringdon St (between Holborn Viaduct and Charterhouse St)

3. Do you support the proposals for Section 2 - Farringdon St (between Holborn Viaduct and Charterhouse St) - of the North-South Cycle Superhighway? (Required)
   Please select only one item
   - Yes
   - Partially
   - Not sure
   - No opinion
   - No

   Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 2 - Farringdon St (between Holborn Viaduct and Charterhouse St)?

Section 3 - Farringdon Rd and Saffron Hill (between Charterhouse St and St. Cross St)
4 Do you support the proposals for Section 3 - Farringdon Rd and Saffron Hill (between Charterhouse St and St. Cross St) - of the North-South Cycle Superhighway?

Please select only one item

☐ Yes  ☐ Partially  ☐ Not sure  ☐ No opinion  ☐ No

Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 3 - Farringdon Rd and Saffron Hill (between Charterhouse St and St. Cross St)?

Section 4 - Farringdon Road and Saffron Hill (between St. Cross St and Ray St)

5 Do you support the proposals for Section 4 - Farringdon Road and Saffron Hill (between St. Cross St and Ray St) - of the North-South Cycle Superhighway?

Please select only one item

☐ Yes  ☐ Partially  ☐ Not sure  ☐ No opinion  ☐ No

Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 4 - Farringdon Road and Saffron Hill (between St. Cross St and Ray St)?

Section 5 - Farringdon Rd, Ray St, Herbal Hill and Warner St

6 Do you support the proposals for Section 5 - Farringdon Rd, Ray St, Herbal Hill and Warner St - of the North-South Cycle Superhighway?

Please select only one item

☐ Yes  ☐ Partially  ☐ Not sure  ☐ No opinion  ☐ No

Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 5 - Farringdon Rd, Ray St, Herbal Hill and Warner St?

Section 6 - Warner St and Phoenix Pl
7 Do you support the proposals for Section 6 - Warner St and Phoenix Pl - of the North-South Cycle Superhighway?

Please select only one item
☐ Yes  ☐ Partially  ☐ Not sure  ☐ No opinion  ☐ No

Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 6 - Warner St and Phoenix Pl?

---

Section 7 - Pakenham St, Calthorpe St and Cubitt St

8 Do you support the proposals for Section 7 - Pakenham St, Calthorpe St and Cubitt St - of the North-South Cycle Superhighway?

Please select only one item
☐ Yes  ☐ Partially  ☐ Not sure  ☐ No opinion  ☐ No

Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 7 - Pakenham St, Calthorpe St and Cubitt St?

---

Section 8 - Ampton St, Sidmouth St and Tavistock Pl

9 Do you support the proposals for Section 8 - Ampton St, Sidmouth St and Tavistock Pl - of the North-South Cycle Superhighway?

Please select only one item
☐ Yes  ☐ Partially  ☐ Not sure  ☐ No opinion  ☐ No

Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 8 - Ampton St, Sidmouth St and Tavistock Pl?

---

Section 9 - Tavistock Pl and Judd St
10 Do you support the proposals for Section 9 - Tavistock Pl and Judd St - of the North-South Cycle Superhighway?

Please select only one item

☐ Yes  ☐ Partially  ☐ Not sure  ☐ No opinion  ☐ No

Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 9 - Tavistock Pl and Judd St?
About you

Privacy notice:

Transport for London (TfL) will use the information you supply in response to this consultation only for the purpose of assessing opinions for this consultation. Responses may be made publicly available, but personal details will be kept confidential. You do not have to provide any personal information, but this information will help TfL to understand the range of responses, and to contact you about this consultation. For example, responses may be analysed by postcode areas to identify local issues.

**Please note**: Cookies are essential for this survey (for more information on cookies, please click on the following link: https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/cookie_policy).

11 What is your name?

Name

12 What is your email address?

This is optional, but if you enter your email address then you will be able to return to edit your consultation at any time until you submit it. You will also receive an acknowledgement email when you complete the consultation.

We will also email you when the results of the consultation are published.

Email

13 What is your postcode?

You do not have to provide your postcode, but it is useful for analysis purposes. All personal details will be kept confidential.

Postcode

14 Are you (please tick all boxes that apply)

- [ ] Local resident
- [ ] Business Owner
- [ ] Employed locally
- [ ] Visitor to the area
- [ ] Commuter to the area
- [ ] Not local but interested in the scheme
- [ ] Other (please specify below)

15 If responding on behalf of an organisation, business or campaign group, please provide us with the name below.

**Please note**: If you are responding on behalf of an organisation it should be in an official capacity.

Organisation
16 What types of transport do you normally use locally (please tick all boxes that apply)?

- [ ] private car
- [ ] motorcycle/powered two-wheeler (moped etc)
- [ ] taxi
- [ ] van
- [ ] lorry
- [ ] bus
- [ ] coach
- [ ] cycle
- [ ] walk
- [ ] tube
- [ ] other (please specify)

Other:

17 On average, how often do you cycle?

Please select only one item:

- [ ] most days
- [ ] about once a week
- [ ] about 1-3 times a month
- [ ] less often
- [ ] never

18 If you do cycle, is it for (please tick all boxes that apply)

- [ ] leisure
- [ ] training
- [ ] work
- [ ] commuting
- [ ] other (please specify)

Other:

19 How did you hear about this consultation?

Please select only one item:

- [ ] Received a leaflet through the door from TTL
- [ ] Handed a leaflet from a TTL representative on the street
- [ ] Received an email from TTL
- [ ] Visited a TTL exhibition
- [ ] Saw a poster or flyer (please say where below)
- [ ] Read about it in the paper (including online)
- [ ] On social media
- [ ] From a blog (please name the blog below)
- [ ] In a newsletter or e-newsletter (please name the newsletter below)
- [ ] Saw it advertised online (such as Google and TTL.gov)
- [ ] Other (please say)

Other/name/place:

20 Please tell us what you think about the quality of this consultation (for example, the information we have provided, any printed material you have received, any maps or plans, the website and questionnaire etc.)

Comments:

21 Are you happy for us to contact you in the future about the North-South Cycle Superhighway?

Please select only one item:

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
Appendix C: Consultation leaflet & consultation area

We are also consulting at the same time on initial ideas to simplify the road network in the King’s Cross area. See TfL.gov.uk/kings-cross-gateway by 20 March 2016 when the consultation closes or take a leaflet from one of the public events.

As part of the Central London Grid, Camden Council is also consulting on proposed cycling improvements to link with the North-South Cycle Superhighway at the junction of Judd Street and Euston Road, continuing along Midland Road. This consultation will run from 15 February.

See consultations.london.gov.uk/environment/midland for details or take a leaflet from one of the events.

Consultations close on Sunday 30 March 2016.

What are we proposing?
Transport for London (TfL), together with Camden and Islington Councils, would like your views on proposals for the North-South Cycle Superhighway (CS6) between Stonecutter Street (near Holborn Viaduct) and King’s Cross.

We previously consulted on the North-South Cycle Superhighway in autumn 2014 and are currently constructing the first phase between Elephant & Castle and Stonecutter Street. The proposals in this consultation would continue the substantially-segregated cycle route along main roads to Farrington Road, and provide cycle improvements along quieter back streets towards King’s Cross.

Further details are available at TfL.gov.uk/cycle-north-south

Why are we proposing this?
Cycling is now a major mode of transport in London. In 2014, 540,000 journeys a day were made by bike, a 10 per cent increase from 2013. Cycling during the morning rush hour in London has more than trebled since 2000.

The North-South Cycle Superhighway has been designed to improve safety and reduce conflict between motor vehicles and cyclists, and to encourage the large numbers of people who would like to cycle, but currently feel unable to do so.

Data from existing Cycle Superhighways suggests the new route would also draw cyclists away from other routes in central London which are less suitable for them.

Where the North-South Cycle Superhighway would go
The proposed route would start at Stonecutter Street, where the North-South Cycle Superhighway continues south to Elephant & Castle. It would continue north on Farrington Road to Greville Street, connecting with the proposed Central London Grid at West Smithfield. At Greville Street, northbound cyclists would turn onto a quiet back street route continuing to King’s Cross.

Southbound cyclists from King’s Cross would turn off the back-street route onto Farrington Road at Ray Street via a new signalised junction and continue south on a stepped cycle track.

*Source: TfL’s London Report 8*
What impacts this scheme would have on other road users

Traffic and bus impacts:
We do not expect these proposals to noticeably increase journey times for other road users, and in some cases our modelling shows improvements. There will still be some increases in journey times overall on the route when compared to the existing situation before construction for other schemes commenced. This is because of the impact of other schemes nearby that are not part of this consultation.

Pedestrian wait times at existing-signalised junctions are proposed to remain the same, and wait times at Farrington Station are expected to reduce because of the closure of Great Eastern Street to motor traffic. New signalised pedestrian crossings are proposed at Charterhouse Street, Ray Street and where Clerkenwell Road meets Smithfield and Herbal Hill.

Parking and loading:
Although we have designed our proposals to minimise the impact on parking and loading, we would need to relocate or remove some existing kerbside parking and loading to make space for the cycle route. Some loading provision would also operate for less time.

Businesses, servicing and deliveries:
We continue to work with businesses and freight operators to minimise the impact of these proposals on their operations. If your home or workplace is on or near the proposed route please let us know if the proposals could affect your deliveries, collections and servicing. We encourage you to discuss these proposals with the companies undertaking these operations.

Details are available at tfl.gov.uk/cycle-north-south

How do I view the proposals and have my say?

You can view your say and view our detailed proposals at tfl.gov.uk/cycle-north-south. The consultation closes on Sunday 20 March 2016. We will also be holding a number of public events where you will have the opportunity to see details of the proposals and talk to the project team.

You can see the proposals at:
- King’s Cross Underground main ticket hall below the main concourse of King’s Cross Station (Northern Concourse for Northern, Piccadilly and Victoria lines) from 10.00 to 19.00 on Friday 12 February
- Hornsey Room, Kings Place, 90 York Way, NW1 9AG on Monday 15 February from 18.30 to 20.30
- Hornsey Room, Kings Place, 90 York Way, NW1 9AG on Friday 19 February from 14.00 to 17.00
- Farrington Underground new passageway entrance in Cowcross Street from 15.00 to 18.00 on Friday 18 March.

For the consultation these will also be the project launch for the King’s Cross concourse and Judd Street/Midland Road consultations.

More events will be added to the consultation website at tfl.gov.uk/cycle-north-south

You can also request paper copies of plans and response forms, copies in Braille, large text or another language by emailing consultations@tfl.gov.uk, writing to FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATION or calling 0843 222 1133**

**Service and network changes may apply.
Dear ,

TfL, along with Camden and Islington councils, would like your views on proposals to continue the North-South Cycle Superhighway, CS6, through central London, from Stonecutter Street in Farringdon to King’s Cross. This is part of the Mayor’s Vision for Cycling.

For full details and to have your say, please visit tfl.gov.uk/cycle-north-south

The proposals would mean changes to road layouts to improve safety for cyclists, including a two-way substantially segregated cycle route on Farringdon Road and a new back-street cycle route north of Farringdon station to King’s Cross.

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.
Dear Stakeholder

We, together with Camden and Islington Councils, would like your views on proposals for the North-South Cycle Superhighway (CS6) between Stonecutter Street (near Holborn Viaduct) and King’s Cross. We previously consulted on the North-South Cycle Superhighway in autumn 2014 and are currently constructing the first phase between Elephant & Castle and Stonecutter Street.

Detailed proposals and additional information, including predicted traffic impacts, can be viewed at tfl.gov.uk/cycling/northsouth.

What are we proposing?

The proposed route would start at Stonecutter Street, where the North-South Cycle Superhighway continues south to Elephant & Castle. It would continue north on Farringdon Road to Greville Street, connecting with the proposed Central London Grid at West Smithfield. At Greville Street, northbound cyclists would turn onto a quiet back-street route continuing to King’s Cross.

Southbound cyclists from King’s Cross would turn off the back-street route onto Farringdon Road at Ray Street via a new signalised junction and continue south on a stepped cycle track. The back-street route connects with the Central London Grid on Calthorpe Street to Bloomsbury and Angel. There are also connections with the proposed Central London Grid along Midland Road to Royal College Street, Camden Town and Swiss Cottage.

The new route would mean major changes to the road layout including dedicated cycle lanes replacing sections of traffic and bus lane on Farringdon Road and Farringdon Street, redesigned junctions with improved priority for cyclists, new traffic restrictions to help traffic flow and create better conditions for cycling including banned turns for motorists, wider footways and public spaces, new signalised pedestrian crossings, and changes to parking and loading.

We are also consulting at the same time on initial ideas to simplify the road network in the King’s Cross area. See tfl.gov.uk/kings-cross-gyratory. As part of the Central London Grid, Camden Council is also consulting on proposed cycling improvements to link with the North-South Cycle Superhighway at the junction of Judd Street and Euston Road, continuing along Midland Road. This consultation will run from 15 February.

We are inviting comments on the proposals now, so please visit tfl.gov.uk/cycling/northsouth to find out more and to fill in the online survey. You can
also find details on our website about public exhibitions, where you can view the proposals, speak to members of the project team and ask questions. The deadline for comments is **Sunday 20 March 2016**.

Yours faithfully

Simon Mouncey  
Consultation Team  
Transport for London
Appendix E: List of stakeholders emailed

3663 First for Foodservice
AA
AA Motoring Trust
Abellio West London
Action for Blind People
Action on Hearing Loss (Formerly RNID)
Age Concern London
Age UK
Age UK London
Alan Hughes
Alive in Space Landscape and Urban Design Studio
Anderson Travel
Andrew Boff AM
Andrew Dismore MP
Andrew Rosindell MP
Andrew Slaughter MP
Angela Watkinson MP
APC-Overnight
Arriva Kent Thameside/Kent & Sussex Arriva Guildford & W Sussex
Arriva London North
Arriva Shires/ E Herts and Essex
Asian Peoples Disabilities Alliance
Association of British Drivers
Association of Car Fleet Operators
Association of Town Centre Management
aswashton - superdrug
ATCoaches t/a Abbey Travel
Automobile Association
Barking and Dagenham
Barry Gardiner MP
Best Bike Training //Cycletastic
Better Transport
Bexley Accessible Transport Scheme
Bexley Council
BHS Bikeability
Bidvest logistics
Bikeworks
BikeXcite
Blue Triangle Buses
Bob Blackman MP
Bob Stewart MP
Boris Johnson MP
Breakspears Road Project
Brentwood Community Transport
Brewery Logistics Group
British Cycling
British Land
British Medical Association
British Motorcyclists Federation
British Retail Association
British School of Cycling
BT
Bucks Cycle Training
Bus Watch West Haringey
Business B t/a Expeditional Buzzlines
CABE - Design Council
Camden Council
Camden mobility forum
Campaign for Better Transport
Campbell's
Canal & River Trust London
Capital City School Sport Partnership
Caroline Pidgeon AM
Carousel Buses
Catherine West MP
CBI
CBI-London
Centaur Overland Travel
Central London Cab Trade Section
Central London CTC
Central London Forward
Central London Freight Quality Partnership
Central London NHS Trust
Centre for Accessible Environments
Chalkwell Garage & Coach Hire
Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport
Chris Grayling MP
Chris Philip MP
Christopher Stephen Hunn t/a Travel with Hunny/TWH
Chuka Umunna MP
City Bikes (Vauxhall Walk)
City link
City of Westminster
City of London
City of London Access Forum
Clive Efford MP
Cobra Corporate Services
Community Transport Association
Confederation of Passenger Transport
Covent Garden Market Authority
Crispin Blunt MP
Cross River Partnership
Croydon Coaches UK t/a Coaches Excetera
Croydon Mobility forum
CT Plus t/a Hackney Community Transport
CTC
Cycle Confidence
Cycle Confident
Cycle Experience
Cycle Newham
Cycle Systems
Cycle Training East
Cycle Training UK (CTUK)
Cyclelyn
Cycle-wise Thames Valley
Cycling Embassy of Great Britain
Cycling Tuition
cycling4all
Cyclists in City
Darren Johnson AM
David Burrowes MP
David Evennett MP
David Gauke MP
David Lammy MP
Dawn Butler MP
Department for Transport
DHL
DHL Express
DHL UK & Ireland
Diane Abbott MP
Diane Abbott MP
Disability Alliance
Disability Rights UK
Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee
Dominic Raab MP
Dr Mathias MP
E Clarke & Son (Coaches) t/a Clarkes of London
Ealing Council
East and South East London Thames Gateway Transport Partnership
East Surrey Rural Transport Partnership t/a Polestar Travel
ECESurface TEAM
EDF Energy
Edmonton CLP
Eleanor Laing MP
Emily Thornberry MP
Enfield Council
English Heritage
English Heritage - London
Ensign Bus Company
Evolution Cycle Training
Express Network Forum
Representative from (Robin Parr-Davis will co-ordinate response)
Federation of Small Businesses
Fiona MacTaggart MP
Fiona Twycross AM
First Beeline Buses
Freight Transport Association
Friends of Earth
FTA
Future Inclusion
G4S
Gareth Bacon AM
Gareth Thomas MP
Gatwick Flyer
Gavin Barwell MP
GLA Strategy Access Panel members
Go-Coach Hire
Golden Tours (Transport)
Grant Shapps MP
Greater London Authority
Greater London Forum for Older People
Greater London Forum for Elderly
Green Flag Group
Green Urban Transport
Greg Hands MP
Guide Dogs
Guide Dogs Association
Guide Dogs for Blind - Inner London District team
Guide Dogs for Blind Association
Hackney Safer Transport Team
Haringey mobility forum
Haringey Safer Transport Team
Harriet Harman MP
Health Poverty Action
Heidi Alexander MP
Helen Hayes MP
Hermes Europe
Hertfordshire County Council
Highgate Society
Hillingdon Council
Hillingdon mobility forum
Homerton Hospital
Hounslow mobility forum
HR Richmond t/a Quality Line
Iain Duncan Smith MP
IBM
Inclusion London
Independent Disability Advisory Group
Institute for Sustainability
Institute of Advanced Motorists
Institution of Civil Engineers
Islington Council
Islington mobility forum
J Brierley & E Barvela t/a Snowdrop Coaches
James Berry MP
James Bikeability
James Brokenshire MP
James Cleverly MP
Jane Ellison MP
Jennette Arnold AM
Jenny Jones AM
Jeremy Corbyn MP
Jeremy Reese t/a Little Bus Company
Jim Dowd MP
Jim Fitzpatrick MP
Jo Johnson MP
Joanne McCartney AM
John Biggs AM
John Cryer MP
John Lewis Partnership
John McDonnell MP
Joint Committee on Mobility of Blind and Partially Sighted People (JCMBPSP)
Joint Mobility Unit
Jon Cruddas MP
Olympus Bus & Coach Company t/a Olympian Coaches
On Your Bike Cycle Training
Onkar Sahota MP
Oxford Tube (Thames Transit)
Parcel Force
Parcelforce Worldwide
Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety (PACTS)
Passenger Focus
Patrick McLoughlin MP
Paul Scully MP
Philip Kemp Cycle Training
Planning Design
Porcellio t/a Meridian Duck Tours
Port of London Authority
Powerscroft Road Initiative for Neighbourhood Community & Environment
Premium Coaches
Private Hire Board
Purple Parking
Puzzle Focus
Queen Mary University of London
R Hearn t/a Hearn's Coaches
RAC
RAC Foundation for Motoring
Red Rose Travel
Redbridge Cycling Centre
Redwing Coaches (Pullmanor)
Reliance Travel
Reynolds Diplomat Coaches
Richard Harrington MP
Richard Tracey AM
Richmond Council
RMT Union
RNIB
RNID
Road Haulage Association
Robert Neill MP
Roger Evans AM
Royal Borough of Greenwich
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames
Royal Institute of British Architects
Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors
Royal London Society for Blind People
Royal Mail
Royal Mail Parcelforce
Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI)
Rupa Huq MP
Rushanara Ali MP
Ruth Cadbury MP
Sadiq Khan MP
Sainsbury's Supermarkets
Sam Gyimah MP
Sardar Ali Khan t/a Red Eagle
SCOPE
Seema Malhotra MP
Sense
Siobhain McDonagh MP
Sixty Plus
South Bucks Cycle Training
South East London PCT
South Herts Plus Cycle Training
South London Business Forum
South London Partnership
Southdown PSV
Southgate & Finchley Coaches
Southwark Cyclists
Space syntax
Spokes Cycling Instruction
STA Bikes
Stella Creasy MP
Stephen Hammond MP
Stephen Knight AM
Stephen Pound MP
Stephen Timms MP
Steve O'Connell MP
Steve Reed MP
Stoke Association
Stroud Green Residents Association
Sullivan Bus and Coach
Sunwin Service Group
Sustrans
Sutton Centre for Voluntary Sector
Sutton Mobility Forum
Tania Mathias MP
Taxi and Private hire
Taxi Rank & Interchange Manager
Technicolour Tyre Company
Teresa Pearce MP
Terravision Transport / Stansted Transport
TFL Press Office
TGM Group
Thames Water
Thamesmead Business Services
Association of Guide Dogs for Blind
Big Bus Company
British Dyslexia Association
British Motorcyclists' Federation
Canal & River Trust
City of Oxford Motor Services
Ghost Bus Tours
Kings Ferry
Licensed Taxi Drivers' Association
Original London Sightseeing Tour / London Pride Sightseeing
Owner Drivers' Society
Road Haulage Association
Royal Parks
Theresa Villiers MP
Thomas's London Day Schools (Transport)
TNT
Tom Brake MP
Tom Copley AM
Tony Arbour MP
Tower Hamlets Mobility Forum
Tower Transit Operations
Trade Team
Traffic Management Police Partnership Unit
Trailblazers Muscular Dystrophy UK
Transport for All
Triangle
Tulip Siddiq MP
Tyssen Community School Cycle Training
UK Power Networks
Unions Together
University College London
University of Westminster
Universitybus t/a uno
UPS
Urban Movement
Valerie Shawcross AM
Vandome Cycles
Victoria Borwick AM
Victoria Business Improvement District
Vincenzo Coppola MP
Virendra Sharma MP
Vision Impairment Forum
Walk London
Wandsworth Cycling Campaign
Wandsworth Mobility Forum
Westminster Council
Westminster Cyclists
Wheels for Wellbeing
Whizz-Kidz
Wilson Cycles
Wincanton
www.cyclinginstructor.com
Yodel
Young Lewisham and Greenwich Cyclists
Zac Goldsmith MP
London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames
South London Business Forum
Space Syntax
London Borough of Lambeth
London Borough of Waltham Forest
London Borough of Hillingdon
Conway AECOM
City of Westminster
Westminster City Council
The British Dyslexia Association
British Motorcyclists Federation
Soho Society
The British Motorcyclists’ Federation
Westfield Shepherds Bush
Steer Davies Gleave
London Borough of Brent
Keltbray Limited
London European Partnership for Transport
THAMES EXECUTIVE CHARTERS
Big Bus
ETOA
London Borough of Wandsworth
London Borough of Hounslow
Hillingdon mobility forum
Metropolitan / City Police
City of London Police
London Cab Drivers’ Club
Living Streets
Southwark Cyclists
The Original London Sightseeing Tour /London Pride Sightseeing Ltd,
London Borough of Sutton
Hammersmith & Fulham Cyclists
DHL UK and Ireland
London United Busways Ltd,
TfL
Croydon Coaches (UK) Ltd t/a Coaches Excetera,
GLA
Walk London
Camden mobility forum
Institute of Advanced Motorists
Ringway Jacobs
London Borough of Barnet
Northbank BID
Abellio West London Ltd t/a Abellio Surrey,
London Cycling Campaign
Original Tour
London Borough of Havering
Future Inclusion
Future Inclusion/IDAG
CABE
Residents Society of Mayfair and St James’s
Roadpeace
Campaign for Better Transport
LB Bexley
City Hall
Greater London Authority
British Retail Association
Oxford Tube (Thames Transit),
Automobile Association
The AA
Inclusion London
City of London
London Fire Brigade
aswaston - superdrug
A.S. Watson
First Beeline Buses Ltd,
Golden Tours
Golden Tours (Transport) Ltd,
One Events
House of Commons
TfL (Cycling related projects)
Quietways and Grid
Chalkwell Garage & Coach Hire Ltd,
THAMES LUXURY CHARTERS
Terravision Transport Ltd / Stansted Transport Ltd, Angel BID
English Heritage
City Cyclists
Green Flag Group
London Borough of Haringey
HMRC
Department for Transport
Arriva London North Ltd,
CCG Central London (WESTMINSTER)
Green Line (Arriva)
London Borough of Tower Hamlets
All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group
Blue Triangle Buses Ltd,
LB Ealing
Redwing (Evan Evans)
Redwing Coaches (Pullmanor Ltd),
London Borough of Bromley
London Cycling Campaign (Westminster)
Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI)
RIVER THAMES BOAT HIRE
Northbank Guild
Metrobus Ltd,
TfL River Services
Central London NHS Trust
M Moser associates
London borough of Croydon
Heritage London
MIND
EDF Energy
Barking and Dagenham
LB Enfield
Motorcycle Industry Association
National Motorcycle Council
Croydon Cycling Campaign
Bayswater Residents Association
Freight Transport Association
Ifs learning
Hainault Business Park
Cyclelyn
bikeworks
Cycle Confident
Royal Greenwich Cycle Training
Cycling Tuition
Sixty Plus
Enterprise Mouchel
London Borough of Lambeth
London Borough of Barking & Dagenham LB Haringey
Cyclists in the City
London Borough of Kingston Upon Thames TfL (Specific groups)
London Borough of Westminster
Ministry of Defence
CABE - Design Council
Reliance
Living Streets Action Group
Oxford Tube (Stagecoach)
LB Islington
London TravelWatch
RAC
London Cycling Campaign (Ealing)
CTC ‘Right to Ride’ Network
Reliance Travel,
Argall BID
bikeXcite
London Borough of Lambeth
LB Wandsworth
Westminster City Council
Conservation Officer Royal Parks
Marshalls
Marshalls Coaches,
Sullivan Bus and Coach Ltd
THAMES RIB EXPERIENCE
LB Brent
Guide Dogs Association
London Borough of Newham
London Civic Forum
Institute for Sustainability
Central London Freight Quality Partnership London Chamber of Commerce
South London Partnership
London First
The Excel Centre
Chauffeur and Executive Association
Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee Ealing Cycling Campaign
LB Southwark
The Ghost Bus Tours Ltd
London Private Hire Board
Carlton Motors Ltd
Westminster Abbey
Westminster Abbey
AA
The Automobile Association
Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors
London Borough of Southwark
Westfield London
Leonard Cheshire Disability
Enfield Cycling Campaign
LCC Enfield
LONDON RIVER CRUISES LTD.
National Trust
Sutton Centre for Voluntary Sector
Vogt and Maguire shipbroking Ltd
LOWER THAMES & MEDWAY
Daily Express
Express Newspapers
Sense
London Riverside (Rainham)
Transport for All
Islington mobility forum
Action for Blind People
Vauxhall One BID
Tower Hamlets mobility forum
REEDS RIVER CRUISES
West London
Pedal4Health
London Borough of Richmond-Upon-Thames
Inner and Middle Temple
STA Bikes Ltd.
West London Alliance
Tyssen Community School Cycle Training
LB Lambeth
Age UK London
Bucks Cycle Training
Health Poverty Action
Radio Taxis
VISCOUNT CRUISES/CAMPION LAUNCHES THAMES & ORWELL MARINE SERVICES
London Cycling Campaign (Lewisham)
Croydon
City of Westminster
London Borough of Redbridge
Department for Transport
Birmingham City Council
The Kings Ferry Ltd, Confederation of Passenger Transport UK
3663 First for Foodservice
Cycle Confidence
Greenwich Cyclists
Chauffeur & Executive Assn
Somerset House
The Novotel, City
Hackney Cycling Campaign
HF Cyclists
Haringey Cyclists
Harlow Cycling Campaign
Havering
Household Cavalry Mounted Regiment
Royal Horse Artillery
City of London School
Guide Dogs
Covent Garden Market Authority
Time for Twickenham
LB Bromley
LoveWimbledon BID
National Children's Bureau
E J LANGLEY
GLA
GLA (Planning)
London Borough of Wandsworth
London Chamber of Commerce and Industry (LCCI) Hillingdon Cycling Campaign
Neighbourcare St John's Wood & Maida Vale
The fishmongers company
Hounslow Cycling Campaign
Waterloo Quarter
CSC
DNB Bank
Lambert Council
The hung drawn and quartered
Christopher Stephen Hunn t/a Travel with Hunny/TWH, Age UK
Sainsbury's Supermarkets
Children's Society
Bexleyheath BID
Brookline
CHAS NEWENS MARINE
City Bikes (Vauxhall Walk)
Cycle Experience
Cycle Training UK (CTUK)
Cycle-wise Thames Valley
www.cyclinginstructor.com
Go-Coach Hire Ltd
R Hearn t/a Hearn’s Coaches,
Heart of London Business Alliance
RS Hispaniola
Hyde Park Stables
IT Skillfinder
Disability Alliance
Liam O’Connor Architects
London Bike Hub
London Fire
London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority
Planning Design
CAPE CUVIER LTD
Sloane Robson Investment securities
St John's Wood Society
Stroke Association
THAMES CRUISES
The Mermaid Centre
The Wellington Trust
The Yacht London (Temple Pier)
TOPSAIL CHARTERS
NHS Tower Hamlets CCG
Vandome Cycles
Westminster Cyclists
Westway Development Trust
Wheels for Wellbeing
Wilson's Cycles
Gibson Dunn and Crutcher
Action on Hearing Loss (formerly RNID)
Ocean Leisure
Islington Cycle Action Group
Whizz-Kidz
Urban Movement
Royal Mews
LB Redbridge
Hyde Park Estate Association
LB of Camden
West Twyford Residents’ Association
James Bikeability
The Supreme Court
London Borough of Bexley
Tower RNLI
London Transport Users’ Committee
Joint Committee on Mobility of Blind and Partially Sighted People (JCMBPS) Inner Temple institution
London Borough of Lambeth
Porcellio Ltd t/a Meridian Duck Tours,
Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea
Transport for London (TfL)
Friends of the Earth
London Borough of Barking and Dagenham
Living Streets Southwark
John Lewis Partnership
LPHCA
South Bucks Cycle Training
Mobile Cycle Training Service
Central London Cab Trade Section
Walk England
Liberal Democrats
Haringey mobility forum
South East London PCT
Greater London Authority
Tesco
Department of Transport
Joint Committee on Mobility for Disabled People (JCMD)
Royal Borough of Kensington upon Thames
Trade Team
Royal London Society for Blind People
Premium Tours
Premium Coaches Ltd,
Croydon Council
Croydon mobility forum
Hertfordshire County Council
Ealing Passenger Transport Users’ Group
London Cycling Campaign (Hammersmith and Fulham)
London Duck Tours Ltd
RMT London Taxi branch
Paddington Residents Active Concern On Transport (PRACT) PRACT
HR Richmond Ltd t/a Quality Line,
Best Bike Training/Cycletastic
Wandsworth mobility forum
CT Plus Ltd t/a Hackney Community Transport,
Garratt Business Park (Earlsfield)
Cycle Systems
East and South East London Thames Gateway Transport Partnership On Demand PR & Marketing Ltd.,
London Climate Change Partnership
ICOMOS UK
CPT
Northbank Business Improvement District (BID)
Baker Street Quarter
Living Streets - Brentwood Paddington
Paddington BID
Ocean Youth Connexions
Merton Council
Keith Gould
Hammersmith & Fulham Action on Disability
The Big Bus Company Ltd,
New Addington BID
Kensington and Chelsea Cyclists
RBKC Cycling
The City of Oxford Motor Services Ltd,
X90 (Oxford Bus Co)
DHL
ATCoaches t/a Abbey Travel,
Met Police
KING CRUISES
Kingston Cyclists
Kings Troop
Kimpton Industrial Park (Sutton)
CITY CRUISES PLC
Lambeth Cyclists
RNID (Royal National Institute for Deaf People)
Action on Hearing Loss (RNID)
Hillingdon Council
Fitzrovia Partnership
HMS President.com
CTC, the national cycling charity
Motorcycle Action Group (MAG)
London Suburban Taxi Drivers’ Coalition
Lewisham Cyclists
Cycle Training East
Living Streets - Kings Cross (Camden)
Honourable Artillery Company, Army Ceremonial requirements Apex Hotel and Addendum Restaurant
English Heritage - London
Queensbridge House Hotel
MAYNARD LAUNCHES
RB Kingston
Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames
BBC
Licensed Private Hire Car Association
Licensed Private Hire Car Association (LPHCA)
National Trust - London
Greater London Forum for Older People
E11 BID (Leytonstone)
LB Sutton
Universitybus Ltd t/a uno,
University of Westminster
RMT
London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham
Young Lewisham and Greenwich Cyclists
CROWN RIVER CRUISES
TNT
THAMES LIMO LTD
Megabus/Stagecoach
Metropolitan Police
London Borough Kensington & Chelsea
Wincanton
Transport Initiatives
London Borough of
Richmond-Upon-Thames
BATEAUX LONDON
THAMES LEISURE
Bidvest Logistics
Orpington 1st
London Borough of Sutton
London Councils
LoTAG
LB Havering
Centaur Overland Travel Ltd,
First Group
First Beeline
Mullaney's Coaches,
Willow Lane Trading Estate
(Merton)
Brewery Logistics Group
The Cabinet Office
East Surrey Rural Transport
Partnership t/a Polestar
Travel, Living Streets - Tower
Hamlets
bhs bikeability
Olympus Bus & Coach
Company t/a Olympian
Coaches, Merton Cycling
Campaign
Clarkes
E Clarke & Son (Coaches)
Ltd, t/a Clarkes of London,
Addison Lee
Cycle Newham
Unite The Union
British Land
Confederation of British
Industry (CBI)
Institution of Civil Engineers
Inmidtown
Cross River Partnership
London Mencap
Pimlico FREDAY
Computer Cab
Centre for Accessible
Environments
Laing O'Rourke
In & Around Covent Garden
Westminster City Council
The Kings Ferry
Cabinet Office:
London Borough of
Hammersmith and Fulham
AECOM
Evolution Cycle Training
Purple Parking Ltd,
Newham Cyclists
RNIB
London Borough of Sutton
Motorcycle Action Group
London Borough of
Hammersmith
London Borough
Hammersmith & Fulham
cycling4all
Transport for Greater
Manchester
Federation of Small
Businesses
BT
Carousel Buses Ltd
Jeremy Reese t/a The Little
Bus Company,
Red Rose Travel
Association of Town Centre
Management Olympian
On Your Bike Cycle Training
TURK LAUNCHES
Line Line Coaches (TGM),
National Grid
London Cycling Campaign
(Tower Hamlets) Bayswater
BID
Hammersmith London
Queen Mary University of
London
Local Government
Ombudsman
UK Power Networks
Private Hire Board
Kingston mobility forum
Ensign Bus Company Ltd,
Tower Transit Operations Ltd,
Royal Mail
Marylebone Association
National Express Ltd
THAMES RIVER SERVICES
Vision Impairment Forum
University College London
Land Securities
London Central Cab Section
Rank and Highways
Representative for Unite
Taxi and Private hire
Unite the Union (taxis)
Croydon Safer Transport
Team
LB Lewisham
London Older People's
Strategy Group
Unite
Southgate & Finchley
Coaches Ltd
National Grid
Phil Jones Associates
London General
Canary Wharf Management
Ltd
City of London Access Forum
philip kemp cycle training
Downing Street
Cycling Embassy of Great
Britain
British American Tobacco
Metroline Ltd
London Cycling Campaign
(Kensington and Chelsea)
British Medical Association
Middle Temple institution
Rabobank
RADAR London Access
Forum
TGM Group Ltd
Redbridge Cycling Centre
The O2
Sardar Ali Khan t/a Red
Eagle,
Redbridge Cycling Campaign
The Grange City Hotel
Bayliss Executive Travel
UPS
Reynolds Diplomat Coaches
London Tourist Coach
Operators Association
(LTCOA) LTCOA
House of Common
Get Sutton Cycling
Chelsea Society
Brentwood Community
Transport,
Royal Institute of British
Architects
Trailblazers, Muscular
Dystrophy UK
In Holborn
London Cab Drivers’ Club Ltd
London Cab Drivers Club
Heathrow Airport
Enfield Council
AA Motoring Trust
Design for London
Woodfines
Crown Equerry
Living Streets London
British School of Cycling
WOODS RIVER CRUISES
DHL Express
Living Streets
WESTMINSTER PARTY
BOATS
Living Streets - Sutton
Westminster Special Events
Tower Hamlets Wheelers
Brasserie Blanc
Business B Ltd t/a The
Expeditional,
Belgravia Residents
Association
Thomas's London Day
Schools (Transport) Ltd
Waltham Forest Cycling
Campaign
Parliamentary Estates
Westminster Cycling
Campaign
Edgware Road Partnership
UK Supreme Courts
The Company of Watermen
and Lightermen Fitzrovia
Neighbourhood Association
Greater London Forum for
the Elderly
APC-Overnight
BBC Media Village
Canary Wharf Group
CCG Hammersmith &
Fulham
CCG NHS Central London
City link
City of London conservation
officer
City of London Girls School
Coach Operators
Crossrail Ltd
Crown Estates
Environment Agency
J P Morgan
Network Rail
Open Spaces Yard
Parcel Force
Parliament House
Parliamentary Estates
Portcullis House
Queen Elizabeth II
Conference Centre
RICS and Roux Restaurant
RNLI
Salvation Army International
Headquarters
Savoy Hotel
St Benets Met Welsh Church
Stable Way Tenants &
Residents Assoc
Sweetspot Events
The Double Tree by Hilton
The Liberty bounds public
house
The Owner Drivers™
Society
The Walrus and Carpenter
public house
Tour Bus Operators
Tower Hamlets conservation
officer
University of the Arts (The
Costume Store)
Urban Martial Arts London
Wandsworth Community
Transport
Wellington Barracks
Westbourne Green Sports
Complex
Westminster Society
Westway Sports Complex
TDSCG (Tunnel Design and
Safety Consultation Group)