

By email: 12 Feb

To Chair of KOV Forum

Dear Ms Monger,

Thanks for your detailed response to the latest CS5 consultation, and for acknowledging the work TfL has done to incorporate feedback from local people and stakeholders in our proposals. We apologise for the long response time, and hope you find the following useful.

### **1. “Increased journey times for all road users (except cyclists) and pedestrians”**

Initial modelling analysis of these latest designs shows that the completed scheme could mean longer journeys at the busiest times for some motorists and bus, coach and taxi passengers and shorter journey times for others. The most significant of these impacts equate to one to two minutes increases to some journey times and one to two minutes journey time savings for others. We continue to finalise our analysis, which does not yet account for wider changes to the road network which are expected to reduce the predicted increases.

The removal of a section of bus lane on Kennington Oval and Harleyford Road is fundamental to the scheme as there is only one traffic lane in each direction. If we were to remove the traffic lane, rather than the bus lane, this would prohibit all westbound vehicles through this section of route. We are continuing to finalise the traffic modelling of the latest designs, but current analysis indicates that the removal of this section of the bus lane will not have a significant impact on journey times.

We consider the overall impact on traffic to be acceptable, given the safety benefits CS5 would offer to the thousands of cyclists who pass through Vauxhall every day. However, we continue to study the traffic impacts and will work to mitigate any impacts as much as possible (see below).

In order to manage any expected impacts from this, and other schemes in the area, we will continue to invest in our sophisticated traffic management system and will implement an advanced traffic signal management programme to allow us to better manage traffic depending on differing conditions at any given time. We also have a range of other measures to manage traffic in London, including increased enforcement in areas at risk of congestion, influencing freight and servicing activity to reduce traffic volumes at busy times and locations, and improved driver information to enable more accurate journey planning. We expect that these measures will collectively have a positive impact on predicted journey time changes.

Where there are increases in journey times for bus routes impacted by the scheme, a £200 million programme of work is being developed, which will implement improvements designed to save time along the affected routes by addressing delays and giving priority to buses at certain pinch-points. Again, this is expected to reduce any predicted journey time increases.

The traffic models used for appraisal of CS5 predict journey times at the busiest times of day and do not take account of behaviour change, such as motorists deciding to travel at different times of day or using other forms of transport.

TfL values bus customers very highly, and we believe CS5 strikes the right balance between protecting vulnerable people on bicycles through a high risk area and optimising other transport modes.

### **2. “Increased CO2 emissions and reduced air quality resulting from the traffic sitting idle for longer periods of time”**

The expectation that CS5 will increase emissions and reduce air quality is based on the assumption that motor traffic journeys will take substantially longer. The evidence does not support that assumption and overall emissions are expected to decrease marginally.

By providing safe passage through what is currently a major barrier to cycling in this area, we expect CS5 to contribute towards the Mayor's strategy to increase the modal share of cycling in Greater London, with the effect of improving air quality and reducing CO2 emissions. Cycling, which has zero emissions, improves air quality for everyone. Cycling rates across Greater London have doubled over the last ten years, so now cyclists comprise a quarter of peak hour traffic in central London, and schemes like CS5 will help continue that trend.

In June 2012, a report for the Central London Air Quality Cluster group of local authorities analysed 'cost-effective actions to cut air pollution'. It found that if just 14 per cent of journeys in central London were cycled, emissions of the greatest vehicle pollutant, NOx, would fall by 30 per cent, or 453 tonnes a year. And emissions of the other main vehicle pollutant, particulate matter, would fall by 24 per cent, or 34 tonnes a year.

### **3. "Adverse economic impact"**

The expectations of adverse economic impact are based on assumptions that there will be significant delays to motor traffic. The evidence does not support these expectations (see above). Furthermore, by making more cycling journeys more attractive to more Londoners, we expect CS5 to provide substantially positive economic benefits. For example, as per the project's business case, we expect to see an annual health benefit of £460,000 from people shifting their mode of transport to cycling along this route.

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

Over a 36-month period of collision data reviewed as part of the design process for CS5 there were 236 collisions recorded in the vicinity of the scheme, including two fatalities and 32 serious injury collisions. Two thirds of these collisions caused injury to cyclists, pedestrians and motorcycle drivers. Through providing segregation and improvements to pedestrian facilities the scheme is seeking to design out a large number of these collisions wherever possible.

More financial information about the Cycling Vision Portfolio is available in the TfL Board paper from 5 February 2014 (<http://www.tfl.gov.uk/cdn/static/cms/documents/board-20140205-part-1-item06-cycling-vision-portfolio.pdf>). The costs and benefits of the Cycle Superhighway proposals were discussed at the TfL Board in February 2015, and a decision was taken to proceed with CS5.

### **4. "Increased risk of accidents and congestion on other local roads"**

Best evidence suggests the impact on motor traffic journeys will not be substantial. Therefore, we do not agree that motor traffic will be displaced to Fentiman Road, nor that there will be increased risk of collision on surrounding streets.

The number of people killed or seriously injured on London's roads each year has more than halved since 2000. And we have overseen a 31% reduction in pedestrians killed and seriously injured in 2013 (compared with the 2005-09 average). We have a target to reduce by 40 per cent the number of people killed or seriously injured on the Capital's roads by 2020, prioritising the safety of the most

vulnerable groups: pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists – who make up 80 per cent of serious and fatal collisions.

## **5. “Severe problems outside the Royal Vauxhall Tavern (RVT)”**

We are pleased you recognise the improvements in the new design, including the dedicated cyclist crossing, outside the RVT. Cyclists will still be legally able to use the road, and some cyclists may continue to do so, but we expect the majority of cyclists riding through the gyratory to use CS5.

Cyclists generally adapt their behaviour to their surroundings. Thus, those who share space with motorists on busy roads can sometimes cycle faster in order to keep up with motorists (to reduce the likelihood of slowing motorists down and encouraging them to overtake in a dangerous manner). Providing a protected environment removes the need to do this.

The proposals are also designed to encourage the many people who would like to cycle to work or school or to the shops but do not feel safe enough to do so. This demographic of less confident cyclists - particularly from groups currently under-represented among cyclists such as women, children and the elderly - are less likely to demonstrate the faster or more assertive riding behaviour you are concerned about.

There will be a clear demarcation of space for cycling, which is designed to reduce conflict between cyclists and pedestrians and between cyclists and motor traffic.

### **5.1. “CS5 does not address the concerns of most local cyclists when approaching Vauxhall Gyratory”**

While the survey data KOV provided shows demand for a variety of cycle movements that we are seeking to accommodate through CS5 and future Quietway upgrades, we do not consider the survey data supplied robust enough to accurately demonstrate cyclist movements due to the small sample periods. Our designers have considered numerous survey datasets that cover several hours of survey periods on numerous days. Cycling demand in the area was also observed in the results of the London Cycle Census data published in October 2013.

Our data shows that CS5 would meet substantial demand for cyclists making east-west journeys across London, and we expect the scheme to attract cyclists away from alternative routes as well as attract new cyclists as cycling facilities become more attractive. Vauxhall gyratory is currently seen as a barrier to cycling due to a lack of adequate cycle infrastructure provision, and the CS5 route is considered strategically important in unlocking cycling potential in South London.

### **5.2. “CS5 is being introduced out of sequence with the other changes proposed to the Vauxhall Gyratory”**

Changes to the Vauxhall gyratory are unlikely to take place for several years. The CS5 project is at a much more advanced stage and we are in a position to implement a scheme that would provide for substantially safer journeys for thousands of people on bicycles every day. Improving safety is a key factor driving forward the CS5 project, and any advantages gained by delaying the CS5 project for several years until the Vauxhall gyratory plans were finalised would be outweighed by the increased risk to cyclists in the area over that same period.

### **5.3. “Inadequacies of the consultation process”**

#### **5.3.1. Lack of traffic modelling figures (as for Vauxhall Cross)**

The consultation material provided an adequate summary of the potential traffic impacts, and gave respondents sufficient information with which to make informed comment.

Due to design changes following the last public consultation, we only had preliminary modelling results for the latest CS5 proposal (where the cycle track is moved to the south side of Harleyford Road). Based on these preliminary modelling results, we predict reductions in journey times for motor traffic compared with the previous proposal, with only minor delays to buses overall. However, these modelling results were not finalised at the time of consultation, and were therefore not suitable for publication. The modelling results are now finalised, and we would be happy to meet to discuss them.

As stated previously, analysis based on the current proposals shows the completed scheme could mean longer journeys at some locations for motorists and bus, coach and taxi passengers. However, at other locations this could also mean shorter journey times for road users.

### 5.3.2. No choice of routes for CS5 consultation as in Belgravia

Westminster City Council is looking at several options to extend CS5 onwards from Pimlico. Options for this would be on borough roads and aside from the Vauxhall Bridge Road alignment. The alternative routes being investigated provide a route that, in the medium term, would not route cyclists into roads affected by Victoria Station upgrade works and highway changes proposed as part of the Victoria Vision.

### 5.4. Alternative route proposed by resident’s merits further consideration

TfL has looked at alternative routes, including the suggested alignments via (1) Kennington Lane (2) Glasshouse Walk and (3) Jonathan Street. All three introduce substantial extra distance, which for cyclists is a major disincentive to using them. TfL recognises that good design for cycling, as for pedestrians, involves creating routes that follow desire lines where possible – in this case along Harleyford Road.

Route alignment	Distance	% extra distance compared with proposed route
Harleyford Road (CS5 proposed route)	850 metres	-
Kennington Oval/Vauxhall Street/Kennington Lane	1300 metres	53%
Kennington Oval/Vauxhall Street/Glasshouse Walk	1500 metres	76%
Kennington Oval/Vauxhall Street/Jonathan Street	1700 metres	100%

Compared with the Harleyford Road route, routing via Kennington Lane is 53% longer between Oval and Victoria, via Glasshouse Walk is 76% longer, and via Jonathan Street is 100% longer – all of these extra distances are substantial in the context of providing schemes that aim to make ‘human-powered’ transport attractive.

In addition, the alternative proposal via Kennington Lane would require additional traffic light phases at the junctions of Kennington Lane and Vauxhall Street, and Kennington Lane and Durham Street, which would introduce substantial delays on this section of the Ring Road, potentially congesting motor traffic as far back as Vauxhall Bridge. It would also require the introduction of

cycle lanes on a two-way road that, in parts, has only one lane in each direction – effectively removing all or part of one of those lanes. Our investigations concluded that this would have much greater impact on motor traffic flow across the area than the reduction by one lane of three-lane one-way Harleyford Road. Opposition from Vauxhall Pleasure Gardens would make putting a route through that space additionally difficult.

The alternative proposals that route cyclists via Glasshouse Walk and Jonathan Street are not feasible. There is a strong likelihood that investment in a route of this nature, which loops back on itself, would result in cyclists continuing to use the direct route along Harleyford Road, providing minimal safety benefit. In addition, both alternatives would require lane removal on Albert Embankment.

### **Deliveries and emergency needs**

Taxis can pick up and set down from double red lines at any time so would not be affected by changes to the parking restrictions. As with the current layout, loading and deliveries are permitted to park on stretches of single red line outside of the restriction hours. While there will be an overall loss of single red line capacity, there are still numerous sections of single red line provided to meet the parking and loading capacity in line with surveys which we have been undertaken on weeknights and weekend nights. In the event daytime parking is required then parking dispensations can be obtained.

Following a further meeting with local residents and Kate Hoey MP, we are also proposing to retain Sunday parking on the single red lines provided on Harleyford Road. We will seek to monitor the impact this has on congestion as the road will be reduced to one lane. We are also seeking to provide a loading bay on Vauxhall Grove to accommodate daytime loading demand from nearby properties.

### **HGV vehicles turning at Durham Street**

Our proposals have tracked the turning of the largest vehicles on London's roads around this corner. To accommodate the turn safely some alterations to the footway and central island would be made. These alterations would ensure HGVs can make the turning in a safe manner. The design of the proposed cycle track is substantially different from the traffic cones and fencing that were in place for work when objections to this part of scheme were formulated.

We hope we've been able to address your concerns over CS5, but if you'd like us to elaborate on any of the issues, please get in touch.

Preliminary construction of CS5 has started, and we will keep you informed of potential disruption as works progress.

Kind regards

Mike Cavenett

Consultation team

Transport for London