



Hounslow Third Local Implementation Plan

Introduction

London Borough of Hounslow ("LBH") published a draft of its Third Local Implementation Plan ("LIP3") for consultation on 5 November 2018. LIP3 explains how the Mayor's Transport Strategy ("MTS") will be delivered in Hounslow ("the Borough"). The Hounslow Cycling Campaign ("We") respond in this document.

Summary

We support the objectives set out in LIP3, including the overarching aim of increasing the proportion of trips in the Borough that are made by active travel or public transport from 56% to 71% by 2041. We welcome LBH's commitment to these strategic objectives.

We regret that the targets are not more ambitious and urge LBH members to show greater political will to deliver modal shift and thus effectively tackle air pollution and climate change.

We suggest that 10-20% of LIP funding should be switched from promotional campaigns and blue sky projects to practical highways engineering. We believe that good infrastructure is self-advertising while even the best advertising is ineffective unless the right infrastructure is in place.

We welcome LBH's intention to use CS9 as the spine of a Hounslow Priority Cycle Network. We believe that this approach will make best use of limited funding to mitigate congestion, improve air quality and save lives. We look forward to working with LBH members and officers on the detailed designs.

Objectives

We campaign for better cycle facilities in Hounslow, offer training and rides, and generally provide a focus for those interested in cycling locally. We believe that increasing the proportion of trips made by active travel or public transport from 56% to 71% would materially mitigate congestion in the Borough, improve its air quality and reduce the number of people killed and seriously injured on its roads. We also support the subsidiary objectives and targets set out in LIP3.

We are concerned that the text of LIP3 sometimes ducks clear statements simply to avoid offence to motorists. Section 3.3, for example, should state the obvious point that congestion is largely caused by motorists in cars. Many car drivers still wrongly believe that bus passengers and cyclists are part of the problem rather than the solution. Some drivers, and even a few LBH members, seem to resent the relative freedom and speed of cycling on the Borough's overcrowded roads.

We doubt whether Programmes 1 and 2, covering road safety engineering and education, will deliver the targeted reduction in KSIs to 40 by 2022. We believe that funding for safety should be

increased and rebalanced from "self-defence" training towards junction improvements that really make the roads safer.

We believe that residents of the Borough would support stronger measures to tackle through traffic on residential streets including modal filters. Objective 04d in section 3.4.5 should be strengthened. Limited funding could be spread further by using low cost physical barriers instead of high cost ANPR control systems.

Overall, we welcome the commitment of LBH to these strategic objectives.

Ambition

We dispute the assertion in LIP3 section 4.11 that the MTS targets for 2041 are ambitious. The MTS sensibly established a hierarchy where active travel and public transport are prioritised over motoring. It did not move forward on road pricing and it did not address political reluctance to re-allocate road space to high quality cycle infrastructure. This was arguably ambitious for London as a whole - our parent organisation believes so - but it is too little, too late for the Borough. LBH residents, many of whom are already multimodal travellers themselves, are particularly afflicted by through traffic and the consequent congestion, air pollution and road KSIs.

We note that the short term targets set out in the table in section 4.13 are approximately 1/7th of the corresponding long term target in most cases. The short term targets are approximately 1/3rd of the corresponding long term target for air quality, which the Mayor wants to get within legal limits by 2028. We can see the logic behind this but are concerned that it leaves no room for slippage.

We accept that the MTS targets will be difficult for LBH to achieve given the low proposed level of funding from TfL. We do not accept that this is insuperable: push factors (as defined on p27) tend to be inexpensive and may even generate income, it is the pull factors that are expensive.

We will do what we can to help LBH members who support actual change rather than pipe dreams. We know that potential cyclists need to see appealing options that work for them rather than read suggestions piled in the local library or dropped through the door. We understand that "carrots" will be politically popular in the short term and "sticks" will be unpopular, the point is that a judicious combination of carrots and sticks is the most effective and economic way to change behaviour.

In short, funding is undoubtedly tight but modal shift can still be delivered if LBH members have the political will to do it.

Funding

We accept that funding, which is controlled by national and regional politicians, is low compared to the sums spent annually on highways maintenance. It must be frustrating for LBH members and officers to have to devote so much effort to bids for such limited funding.

We note that only 50% of the LIP funding has been allocated to programmes 1, 5, 6 and 7 that will deliver better highways infrastructure with tangible benefits. The other 50% has been allocated to various promotional, car-oriented and blue skies programmes. We suggest rebalancing this to 60%:40% or 70%:30%. Good infrastructure is self-advertising: we know from our work on training and rides that people seeing a safe cycle lane think "I could use that" to save time, improve my

fitness and so on. We do not believe that promotional campaigns will effectively deliver modal shift until improved cycle infrastructure and public transport is in place for people to use: it would be better to build first and advertise later. Moreover, campaigns rarely reach the motorists responsible for the through traffic that bedevils the Borough.

CS9 and Priority Cycle Network

LIP3 assumes that CS9 will be built and proposes that it is used as the spine of the Hounslow Priority Cycle Network. We are frustrated that TfL has yet to publish improvements to CS9 following the public consultation in 2017. (Our understanding is that delays have been caused by another borough, namely Hammersmith and Fulham, rather than LBH.) Nevertheless, we expect the flaws in the original design to be ironed out. We agree that developing a network based on CS9 is the right approach as we know that it is gaps in the network that deter potential cyclists.

CS9 may create other opportunities near to the route, such as benefits from installing modal filters on roads joining the route or using cycle parking to revitalise shopping centres.

We have publicised the Hounslow Priority Cycle Network Proposals set out in Appendix A of LIP3 among local cyclists. Initial reactions have been favourable. Written comments logged to date are included in the Appendix. We are unclear whether the funding (p142) is intended for the Feltham to Heathrow T4 route or for the first route to be chosen.

We doubt whether Programme 6, covering networks and corridors, will deliver the targeted level of 17% access to a safe and pleasant cycle network by 2021. LBH has demonstrated in recent years that it has the will and capacity to deliver high quality cycle lanes such as Boston Manor Rd and it was achieving some momentum. We believe that funding for the Priority Cycle Network should be increased so that two routes, not one, are built in the LIP3 period.

In summary, the ideas are good. The acid test will, as ever, be in the implementation. We look forward to contributing to the design of the Network over the period covered by LIP3.

Leslie Scrine, for HCC
27 December 2018

APPENDIX - Member comments on CS9 and Priority Cycle Network

Page	Comment
15	The commuting map (Fig. 2-4) is interesting in the context of CS9 as it shows the area where people are most likely to commute to Central London (hence use CS9...) is Chiswick.
17	Chiswick, where cyclists can make up to 17% of vehicles in peak flows.
22	There is a reference to the Hounslow Local Plan from 2015 which refers to a "cycling spine" along the A315 so another thing to point out
31	The implementation of CS9 would create opportunities for new orbital routes into neighbouring residential areas and transport hubs.
31	Work with TfL and Heathrow Airport to develop cycle routes into the airport. Funding is available from Heathrow Airport to part fund improvements.
37	Why the reliance on toucan crossings as compared to parallel crossings?
37	It would be good to see the priorities for this network (although these may depend on CS9)
40	Route 12: I normally use Ealing Road but suspect that Boston Manor Road would be more popular generally.
40	Route 12: A Brentford - Kensington commuter at the HC party advised that Boston Manor Road is uncomfortable for cycling. He prefers to use Ealing Road or work through The Butts.
40	Desire line 13: I cycle this frequently and think it would be heavily used if safety could be improved. The Sutton Court Road lights are an obvious problem - there is a lot of space at the junction (which used to be a roundabout) but SCR itself is not wide enough for the volume of traffic that it carries.
40	Desire line 14: I cycle this quite often and agree that provision is already pretty good. The tricky bit is Chiswick Common Road to Woodstock Road.
40	Route 15: I like the idea but am not convinced it would work. I used to cycle this quite often and always went up the east pavement of the A316 to Edensor Road instead. Dan Mason Drive is too narrow for the 4x4s that it attracts and the railway bridge is a barrier.
42	Cycling within the borough is too dangerous - it's not a matter of perception. Crashmap shows 122 fatal and serious cyclist casualties in 2013-17 in a rectangle approximating to the borough boundaries.
87	If [CS9 is approved] a modal shift away from the car is expected. Agreed!
102	The borough will formally determine its position on the Chiswick to Brentford section (consulted on in 2017) in Spring 2019
102	CS9 is, as stated, a key decision. It is difficult to see how the targets in the plan could be achieved were the borough to reject this TfL-funded scheme.
102	Connection of existing cycle lanes into a more cohesive network is welcome. Focus on the western part of the borough while CS9 is built is sensible.
105	Public / Political risks are understated. Schemes that encourage modal shift to active travel are unpopular with motorists regardless of the economic, environmental and health benefits. This is difficult for elected members.
116	Target for residents living within 400m of strategic cycle network is 17% by 2021 and 60% by 2041. The figures are OK but the target should be directly linked to "a safe and pleasant" network as in the Mayor's objective.
137	The air quality along M4/A4 corridor is outside borough control. The borough could improve the air quality in Chiswick by supporting CS9 and inexpensive modal filtering between the High Road and the A4.
141	Funding for the Priority Cycle Network is £530k over 3 years. (£150k design and £380k build.) That sounds like "Low Priority" not "High Priority".
141	3 year feasibility for first cycle route, and start of build, but not finish? And not feasibility for second route etc.? And an awful lot of spending on behaviour change compared to highways changes?