

This response is made on behalf of the London Cycling Campaign, the capital's leading cycling organisation with more than 12,000 members and 40,000 supporters. We welcome the opportunity to comment on these plans and our response was developed with input from the co-chairs of our Infrastructure Review Group and is in support of the response of Waltham Forest Cycling Campaign, our local group.

We welcome the theory of Quietways targeting less confident cyclists who want to use low-traffic routes, while also providing for existing cyclists who want to travel at a more gentle pace. We also welcome the Mayor's vision for Quietways that are direct, designed as whole routes, segregated from motor traffic where they briefly join busy roads and make use of "filtered permeability" that restricts through motor traffic etc.

Sadly, our assessment based on the first routes to reach public consultation is that Quietways thus far fail to fulfil these ambitions to the degree needed to genuinely boost cycling numbers.

In this scheme, we welcome the improved facilities for pedestrians, particularly those accessing the schools along Mission Grove. We also welcome the protected tracks on Palmerston Road and Willow Walk. And the use of raised tables (as long as constructed so as to ensure motor vehicles do slow down, while not proving too harsh for cyclists) and sinusoidal speed humps, as well as other measures, to control motor vehicle speed and driver behaviour. And we welcome the links to the Selbourne Road scheme and under the bridge onto South Grove, with the junction treated appropriately. However, there are significant issues that also negatively affect this scheme proposal. Most notably:

- a) Mission Grove – there is a nearly complete lack of cycling-friendly design here. This busy road is used by buses, small goods vehicles and HGVs. It suffers from the Lidl car park routinely being over-full and cars queueing in the road. This road would be ideal for a bus gate or other modal filter. Failing that, it needs far more work done to make it safe, inviting and "quiet" for cyclists. Options could include a two-way track on the north side? Or, if there isn't enough space, a bus/cycle lane in one direction and general motor traffic only allowed in the other direction, with separate cycle track? This would reduce space issues to finding enough space for a single separate cycle track and remove much of the through traffic on the road. Or the road could be made one way to motor vehicle traffic with the bus rerouted in one direction, freeing up plenty of space for a two-way cycle track? These suggestions would obviously require further investigation and appropriate design for speed control and pedestrian comfort etc.
- b) The Blackhorse Road junction fails to ensure cyclists will feel much safer crossing. A viable alternative would be to reroute the QuietWay via the existing Glenthorne Road/ Maude Road crossing.

In general, the London Cycling Campaign would like to see all schemes given a CLoS rating (as well as adhering to the latest London Cycle Design Standards) that demonstrates significant improvement from the current layout will be achieved for cycling (current LCC policy sets out an expectation for new schemes to achieve a CLoS rating of 70 or above), and that eliminates all "critical fails" in any proposed design before being funded for construction, let alone public consultation. In the case of this scheme, that means ensuring all junctions have eliminated serious "hook" turning conflicts etc.