

Response to TfL's consultation from Dr Leon Mannings, Motorcycle Action Group

From: Leon Mannings <leon.drm@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, 10 Nov 2014 12:14:18 +0000

To: <consultations@tfl.gov.uk>

Cc: Johnson Ben<BenJohnson1@tfl.gov.uk>; John Mitchell<john.mitchell@mag-uk.org>

Subject: Cycle Superhighway Consultation

I submit this response to the proposals for the East - West and North - South Cycle Superhighway proposals and ask for this input to be counted as separate objection to each scheme. And I make this submission as a member of the follow groups and have open copied it to TfL's Senior Strategy and Planning Manager for Road Safety who I meet regularly, and MAG's Chairman:

- **Mayor's Roads Task Force**
- **TfL's Design Review Group (DRG) for Cycling Super Highways and the Better Junctions for Cyclists Program**
- **The Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety (PACTS)**
- **Transport Policy and Campaigns Adviser for the Motorcycle Action Group (MAG)**

Overarching thrust of response

I and the hundreds of thousands of Vulnerable Road Users (VRUs) I speak for here object in the strongest possible terms to these proposals – and the way they currently seem to be being pushed through through with inappropriate haste by allocating an unacceptably short period for public consultation.

The fact that TfL has the legal power to impose such a short period for consultation seems to be being used so far to prevent the scale and depth of consideration that these highly questionable and radical proposals should have in the public domain and, for the avoidance of doubt, this is wrong on many levels.

Safety made worse for a key group of VRUs

One crucial impact of these proposals is to reduce road space for use by Powered Two Wheeler (PTW) riders on heavily trafficked routes which will have many adverse impacts on PTW rider's safety and the efficiency of PTW use.

And again for avoidance of doubt, the scale and nature of those adverse impacts on a large group of VRUs has been explained by me personally at all appropriate levels in TfL from the DRG to the Commissioner of Transport for London.

However, and despite the fact that PTW riders are one of the three main types of Vulnerable Road User groups on London's roads, there is no mention whatsoever of these adverse impacts being considered in these proposals – or any evidence that they have been given the breadth and depth of consideration that this critical aspect of road safety is due.

This is wrong, and the proposals should not go any further until TfL not only gives this aspect of road safety due consideration, but produces evidence that it has – and makes evidence of those considerations available in the public domain and open to public scrutiny.

Congestion related problems made worse for the majority on the Routes – and London as a whole

Other highly significant adverse impacts have been noted in the proposals and these include a significant increase in congestion and increased journey times for the majority of London's Road users on and nearby these key routes.

Moreover, and given the crucial importance of optimising the efficiency of the roads network on East – West and North – South routes, plans to significantly reduce that efficiency fly in the face of many things – including basic common sense.

Bus and Coach parking issues

A key section of the East West Route is currently used for parking buses and coaches that have an essential role in the economic and social life of London's West End – this will be eliminated by the proposals and will create problems that need solutions that are missing from the current proposals.

Inadequate consideration of newly found links between cycling and prostate cancer

A primary justification for these proposals is that measures to encourage more people to cycle more is an unquestionably good thing to do.

However, and notwithstanding the many benefits of cycling, senior figures in TfL have been made aware (by me) of new knowledge of a critical disbenefit to men's health.

A recent 'Cycling for Health UK' study* found a "direct" and "dosage related" link of statistical significance between the amount of cycling done by men over fifty, and medically diagnosed cases of prostate cancer. These findings have only just materialised and should be duly considered before the current proposals are implemented as they were drawn up prior to this newly discovered life threatening factor was available for inclusion in the calculations of costs and benefits.

Request for further consideration

In summary, I suggest that there are crucial flaws in these proposals and that further consideration of them is needed within TfL and in the public domain – and that current plans to implement the proposals must be suspended until further consideration of critical factors has been done.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Leon Mannings

Mayor's Roads Task Force

TfL DRG

Campaigns & Policy Adviser

Motorcycle Action Group (MAG)

*An Observational Study of Erectile Dysfunction, Infertility, and Prostate Cancer in Regular Cyclists: Cycling for Health UK Study: Milo Hollingworth, BSc, MBBS, Alice Harper, MA, MSc, MBBS, and Mark Hamer, BSc, PhD, JOURNAL OF MEN'S HEALTH Volume 11, Number 2, 2014