

## Response ID ANON-NBZE-Q779-7

Submitted on 2014-11-05 14:00:38.073742

### East-West Cycle Superhighway Section 1: Tower Hill gyratory

#### 1 Do you support the proposals for Section 1 (Tower Hill gyratory) of the East-West Cycle Superhighway?

No

#### Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 1 (Tower Hill gyratory) of the East-West Cycle Superhighway? :

Taxis should be permitted to use Shorter St along with buses to so that taxi passengers are not subject to substantially increased journey times and fares.

### East-West Cycle Superhighway Section 2: Lower Thames Street - Tower Hill

#### 2 Do you support the proposals for Section 2 (Lower Thames Street / Tower Hill) of the East-West Cycle Superhighway?

No

#### Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 2 (Lower Thames Street / Tower Hill) of the East-West Cycle Superhighway?:

Banned left turn from Lower Thames St into Fish Street Hill would close a very well used route by taxis to take passengers over London Bridge to the station and other destinations such as More London. Alternative routes would mean longer journey times and increased fares for passengers. It would also mean increased numbers of taxis on less suitable roads in the City and on roads in other boroughs.

No access to Trinity Square from Tower Hill/ Byward Street would result in unacceptably long detours for taxi passengers with consequent increases in journey times and fares

The single eastbound lane through Upper and Lower Thames Street would reduce capacity by 50%. This would inevitably substantially increase delays for eastbound traffic even if TfL forecasts state otherwise. There is little scope to improve the through put of traffic at the Tower Bridge junction due to eastbound traffic regularly tailing back to the junction in The Highway.

### East-West Cycle Superhighway Section 3: Upper Thames Street (Lambeth Hill - Arthur Street)

#### 3 Do you support the proposals for Section 3 (Upper Thames Street: Lambeth Hill - Arthur Street)?

No

#### Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 3 (Upper Thames Street / Arthur Street)?:

Reduction to single lane eastbound will increase delays to traffic.

Object to removal of one northbound lane in Queen Street Place which would substantially increase delays for traffic crossing Southwark Bridge.

Object to banned right turn into Swan Lane which would restrict taxi access to the commercial buildings in Swan Lane and Angel Lane where there is a high demand for taxi services.

### East-West Cycle Superhighway Section 4: Upper Thames Street / Puddle Dock / Castle Baynard Street

#### 4 Do you support the proposals for Section 4 (Upper Thames Street/ Puddle Dock/ Castle Baynard Street) of the East-West Cycle Superhighway?

No

#### Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 4 (Castle Baynard Street)?:

Object to reduction to one lane for eastbound traffic which would increase delays to eastbound traffic and result in queuing back along Victoria Embankment.

Many cyclists would probably choose to ride through the underpass rather than travel via Castle Baynard St.

### East-West Cycle Superhighway Section 5: Victoria Embankment (Temple Avenue – Blackfriars)

#### 5 Do you support the proposals for Section 5 (Victoria Embankment: Temple Avenue - Blackfriars) of the East-West Cycle Superhighway?

No

#### Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 5 (Victoria Embankment / Blackfriars)?:

Object to eastbound reduction to single lane which would increase delays to traffic and result in queues back along Victoria Embankment.

Object to closure to general traffic of southern slip road the northern slip road does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate two way traffic without creating unacceptable delays to taxis and general traffic.

Temple Avenue should remain open rather than traffic divert to Carmelite Street.

### East-West Cycle Superhighway Section 6: Victoria Embankment / Temple Place east

#### 6 Do you support the proposals for Section 6 (Victoria Embankment / Temple Place east) of the East-West Cycle Superhighway?

No

**Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 6 (Victoria Embankment / Temple Place east)?:**

Object to reduction to single lane for eastbound traffic.

### **East-West Cycle Superhighway Section 7: Victoria Embankment / Temple Place west**

**7 Do you support the proposals for Section 7 (Victoria Embankment / Temple Place west) of the East-West Cycle Superhighway?**

No

**Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 7 (Victoria Embankment / Temple Place west)? :**

Object to reduction to single lane for westbound traffic at Temple Place which will create a pinch point to reduce the overall capacity of the westbound route.

Support the provision of a proposed new taxi rank.

### **East-West Cycle Superhighway Section 8: Victoria Embankment / Savoy Place / Savoy Hill / Savoy Street**

**8 Do you support the proposals for Section 8 (Victoria Embankment / Savoy Place / Savoy Hill / Savoy Street) of the East-West Cycle Superhighway?**

No

**Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 8 (Victoria Embankment / Savoy Place)? :**

Object to reduction to single lane for eastbound traffic.

### **East-West Cycle Superhighway Section 9: Victoria Embankment / Northumberland Avenue**

**9 Do you support the proposals for Section 9 (Victoria Embankment / Northumberland Avenue) of the East-West Cycle Superhighway?**

No

**Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 9 (Victoria Embankment / Northumberland Avenue)?:**

Object to reduction to single westbound lane at Northumberland Avenue which creates another pinch point to constrain the capacity of the westbound route.

Object to reduction to single lane for eastbound traffic east of Northumberland Ave.

Object to lane reduction in Northumberland Avenue

### **East-West Cycle Superhighway Section 10: Victoria Embankment / Horse Guards Road**

**10 Do you support the proposals for Section 10 (Victoria Embankment / Horse Guards Road) of the East-West Cycle Superhighway?**

No

**Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 10 (Victoria Embankment / Horse Guards Road) :**

Object to reduction to single lane in each direction for general traffic.

Object to banned left turn from Victoria Embankment into Horse Guards Avenue.

### **East-West Cycle Superhighway Section 11: Victoria Embankment / Westminster Bridge**

**11 Do you support the proposals for Section 11 of the East-West Cycle Superhighway?**

No

**Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 11 (Victoria Embankment / Westminster Bridge)?:**

Object to reduction of eastbound and westbound general traffic lanes to single lane in each direction in Victoria Embankment.

Object to banned left and right turns between Victoria Embankment and Westminster bridge. These will mean significantly increased journey times and fares for many taxi passengers and will increase the number of taxis using Parliament Square and Whitehall.

Object to the shortening of bus lanes on Westminster Bridge which along with reduction to single in each direction for general traffic will increase journey times and fares for taxi passengers as well as for those travelling on buses.

Reduction in traffic lanes in Bridge Street will increase congestion.

### **East-West Cycle Superhighway Section 12: Parliament Square/ Great George Street**

**12 Do you support the proposals for Section 12 (Parliament Square / Great George Street) of the East-West Cycle Superhighway?**

No

**Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 12 (Parliament Square)?:**

The proposed banned turns at Westminster Bridge would increase traffic using Parliament Square where a reduction in lanes for general traffic would also increase congestion.

The closure of Horse Guards Road would result in more traffic using Birdcage Walk and Great George St where the reduction to a single lane eastbound would greatly increase congestion.

A reduction to a single lane at the junction of Broad Sanctuary with Parliament Square would increase congestion back along Victoria St.

Banned right turns at Storeys Gate would make access to the local area more difficult and would lead to more vehicles adding to the congestion on other routes.

### **East-West Cycle Superhighway Section 14: Hyde Park Corner**

**13 Do you support the proposals for Section 14 (Hyde Park Corner) of the East-West Cycle Superhighway?**

No

**Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 14 (Hyde Park Corner)?:**

A reduction to two lanes at Constitution Hill/Hyde Park Corner will substantially increase congestion. A previous attempt to reduce capacity at this junction was hastily removed after the affects became clear.

### **East-West Cycle Superhighway Section 15: Hyde Park**

**14 Do you support the proposals for Section 15 (Hyde Park) of the East-West Cycle Superhighway?**

No opinion

**Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 15 (Hyde Park)?:**

### **East-West Cycle Superhighway Section 16: Lancaster Gate**

**15 Do you support the proposals for Section 16 (Lancaster Gate) of the East-West Cycle Superhighway?**

No

**16 Do you prefer route option 1 (Bathurst Street) or route option 2 (Stanhope Terrace) for southbound cyclists?**

Not Answered

**17 Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 16 (Lancaster Gate)?**

**Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 16 (Lancaster Gate)?:**

Lane reductions on Bayswater Road on the approach to the gyratory may lead to additional congestion.

### **East-West Cycle Superhighway Section 17: Westbourne Terrace**

**18 Do you support the proposals for Section 17 (Westbourne Terrace) of the East-West Cycle Superhighway?**

No

**Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 17 (Westbourne Terrace)?:**

Reduction in traffic lanes may cause congestion.

Concerned that segregated cycle lanes, in this section and over the rest of the route, could make picking up and setting down of taxi passengers difficult with possible safety implications. In particular the picking up or setting down of passengers in wheelchairs would be compromised.

### **East-West Cycle Superhighway Section 18: Westway - Acton**

**19 Do you support the proposals for Section 18 (Westway - Acton) of the East-West Cycle Superhighway?**

No

**Do you have any comments on the proposals for Section 18 (Westway)?:**

A reduction in traffic lanes would increase congestion on the Westway.

It is questionable whether many cyclists would want to use this route.

### **Overall Proposals**

**20 Do you support TfL's overall proposals for a new East-West Cycle Superhighway?**

No

**Do you have any comments on the overall proposals?:**

The east - west route is currently the main traffic route across central London, we are completely opposed to the proposals because of the reduction in its capacity and the proposed restrictions on turning movements which would be extremely detrimental to taxi passengers, who would be faced with substantially increased journey times and costs. It should be noted that many taxis and others would seek alternative routes which would add to congestion elsewhere and

increase use of some other less suitable roads over a wider area.

We are also very concerned that taxi passengers' safety could be compromised as their movements would conflict with cyclists when boarding or alighting from taxis which would have to stop alongside the segregated cycle lanes.

Passengers in wheelchairs and others with poor eyesight or various other infirmities would be particularly disadvantaged. It would be difficult to load/unload people in wheelchairs along most of the route due to taxis having few spaces where they would be able to stop and safely put down loading ramps. Please let us know if a safety audit has assessed these issues.

According to TfL's own figures bus, taxi and freight traffic is likely to grow considerably over the next twenty years and we do not accept that a case has been made to take road capacity away from these modes. In order for London to continue to prosper people and goods need to be able to move freely around the highway network and while it is laudable to provide safe routes for cyclists these proposals do not provide the required balanced improvements for all modes. Furthermore, we consider the consultation to be flawed as no air quality assessment seems to have been carried out over either the route itself or the wider area where displaced traffic would divert to.

## About you

### 21 Are you (please tick all boxes that apply):

Other (please specify)

**Other:**

Representative group

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

Not Answered

**Other:**

### 23 On average, how often do you cycle?

Not Answered

### 24 How did you hear about this consultation?

Email

**Other:**

### 25 Do you have any comments about this consultation (e.g. printed materials, website, events etc)?

**Do you have any comments about this consultation (e.g. printed materials, website, events etc)?:**

We believe the consultation to be flawed due to the omission of any air quality assessment.

We would also like to know if a safety audit has assessed the risks to people, including the infirm, while boarding and alighting from taxis across segregated cycle lanes.

### 26 What is your name?

**Name:**

Richard Massett

### 27 What is your email address?

**Email:**

richard@ltda.co.uk

### 28 If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please tell us which one.

**Organisation:**

Licensed Taxi Drivers Association. Also on behalf of the members of the London Cab Ranks Committee. - Unite the union and the London Cab Drivers Club

### 29 What is your postcode?

**Postcode:**

W9 2BA