

## Your Reference: 6093/GL

I am writing on behalf of the Westminster Cycling Campaign to object to the proposed Traffic Management Orders being made as part of the Implementation of the Piccadilly Two Way scheme:

- The City of Westminster (Bus Priority) (No. 1, 1999) (Amendment No. \*) Order 201\*
- The City of Westminster (Free Parking Places) (Bicycles) (Amendment No. \*) Order 201\*
- The City of Westminster (Free Parking Places) (Diplomatic Missions) (No. \*) Order 201\*
- The City of Westminster (Free Parking Places) (Disabled Persons) (No. \*) Order 201\*
- The City of Westminster (Goods Vehicle Loading Bay) (Amendment No. \*) Order 201\*
- The City of Westminster (Motorcycle Parking Places) (Amendment No. \*) Order 201\*
- The City of Westminster (Parking Places) (E Zone) (Amendment No. \*) Order 201\*
- The City of Westminster (Parking Places) (G Zone) (Amendment No. \*) Order 201\*
- The City of Westminster (Prescribed Routes) (No. \*) Traffic Order 201\*
- The City of Westminster (Restriction of Buses) (Terminal Points) (Amendment No. \*) Order 201\*
- The City of Westminster (Taxi Rank) (Amendment No. \*) Order 201\*
- The City of Westminster (Waiting and Loading Restriction) (Amendment No. \*) Order 201\*

## Our Response to the Proposed Traffic Orders

Westminster Cyclists is open to any London Cycling Campaign (LCC) member who lives, works, studies or cycles in the City of Westminster. We aim to encourage people to cycle, improve conditions for cycling, and raise the profile of cycling.

We welcome the intention to assist cyclists, clearly necessary in this part of the borough. Busy roads and one-way systems in quieter streets form substantial barriers to cycling, helping to explain the low cycling levels in Westminster compared to other Central and Inner London boroughs.

We would expect to see East-West and North-South alignments facilitated within this area, to a standard suitable for mass cycling. This requires, as per LCC policy (and national and international standards), direct routes provided **either** with protected space for cycling **or** along streets where motor traffic volumes and speeds are low. On the East-West alignment here, this would mean creating a cycle contraflow across smaller streets, and North-South, protected space.

However, there is no safe North-South alignment planned and the East-West alignment remains interrupted and partial. So while we welcome the proposal to permit contra-flow cycling in part of Jermyn Street (westbound) and Panton Street (eastbound), other elements fail to improve the situation and even worsen conditions for cycling here.

In sum, we feel that the scheme in its current form is unacceptable because it either perpetuates existing barriers to cycling for most users, or creates new ones. It would be acceptable if the four specific objections below were addressed:

## Specific Objections

1. **We object to the closure of Norris Street to cyclists.** This substantially reduces the utility of the contraflow in Panton Street. Retaining cycle access here would enable a safe cycling crossing of Haymarket; blocking cycle access (as proposed) means cyclists coming Westbound along Panton Street have no safe, legal route to continue Westbound. **Either** cycle access must be retained through Norris Street **or** protected space provided along Haymarket (probably a length of two-way

track along the West side of the street, with a safe crossing over to Panton Street), to enable cyclists travelling East or West to get from Jermyn Street to Panton Street.

2. Only a very short section of Jermyn Street is to be made two-way for cycling. **We object to the failure to use these Orders to create an East-West cycle route running from Haymarket to St. James's St.** With more than 10,000 motor vehicles per day, Piccadilly presents an intimidating environment for cycling. Opening up the whole of Jermyn Street for two-way cycling would provide a high-quality, much quieter alternative just 100 metres away. The narrow nature of the street need not be a barrier to contraflow cycling, as this has proven to be safe in boroughs such as Camden and City of London. If this is seen as controversial in a Westminster context we recommend using an Experimental Traffic Order.

3. **We object to the failure to make Charles II Street – a wide, East-West side street – two-way for cycles**, another missed opportunity that would represent an easy quick win.

4. **We object to the design of cycle facilities on Haymarket and Lower Regent Street; in particular the failure to use these Orders to install safe two-way cycle tracks on the East side of Lower Regent Street.** Like Piccadilly and Haymarket, Lower Regent Street has very high motor traffic flows (well over 10,000 motor vehicles per day, with many HGVs) and is a barrier to cycling. LCC policy, the old London Cycle Design Standards, and LTN 2/08 (national guidance) are all clear that separation of cycle from motor traffic is needed at these volumes. Not only is this not proposed, the current junction designs at the end of both Regent Street and Haymarket are dangerous, with left hook risks.

Providing a two-way protected track on Lower Regent Street East side would provide safe access between Duke of York steps (and the cycle track along The Mall) and Piccadilly (an important shopping and leisure destination). There is little kerbside activity planned on the East side of Lower Regent Street apart from a new taxi rank, and the road is wide. Protected tracks here are feasible and would do little to negatively impact other users; in fact, they would benefit many who currently use other modes by providing an environment that opens up the choice for them to cycle.