

London Cycling Campaign is the capital's leading cycling organisation with more than 12,000 members and 40,000 supporters. We welcome the opportunity to submit comments to the National Infrastructure Commission. While the comments below relate to London most have relevance for the rest of the United Kingdom.

3.1

In line with the published terms of reference, the Commission is reviewing the evidence base and the strategic options for future investment in large-scale transport infrastructure improvements in London.

The questions that the Commission is particularly keen to focus on in this initial phase of work are:

1. What are the major economic and social challenges facing London and its commuter hinterland over the next two to three decades?

London's population is growing and expected to exceed 10m. Motor traffic congestion is already a problem in the capital and it will get worse if car ownership and use increases. Public transport also suffers from capacity problems. Maintaining, and increasing, the pace of cycling growth is vital to keep London moving.

London's Mayor has a target in the TfL business plan of doubling cycling's modal share to 1.5 million journeys by 2026 (a 5% share at current population levels). If this target is not achieved there will be the much more costly challenge of getting London's increased population to its various destinations by other means. Cycling infrastructure is significantly less expensive than new road, rail or underground tunnels (and can be minimal if incorporated into road modernisation programmes) yet it offers very efficient use of road space: the newly built East-West cycle superhighway will have the capacity for 1000 cyclists per hour each way – the equivalent of four underground trains.

The number of daily cycling journeys in London already exceeds the total number of journeys on the Docklands Light Railway, London Overground and Tramlink put together. Surveys carried out for TfL indicate that a quarter or more of Londoners would like to cycle or cycle more often. The aspirational target set by TfL and the Mayor of 10% of journeys is achievable and is still well below the existing rates in Amsterdam (36%) and Copenhagen (45%). According to TfL data, in Central London at peak times cycles already account for a quarter of vehicles on the road.

In the context of this inquiry it is worth noting that in the Netherlands 40% of journeys to stations are made by bicycle. This is facilitated by ample cycle parking at stations as well as safe cycling routes to those stations. In the UK cycling accounts for 2% of journeys to stations but that can rise rapidly (e.g. Cambridge) if facilities are provided (a new 3000 space cycle park is being constructed) .

No major road or rail infrastructure programme must be allowed to proceed without consideration of cycle access and parking: Parliamentary approval of the outline plans for St Pancras rail terminus without any requirement for cycle parking or access resulted in a significant barrier to integrated transport use at this flagship location which the local authority was unable to undo.

2. What are the strategic options for future investment in large-scale transport infrastructure improvements in London - on road, rail and underground - including, but not limited to Crossrail 2?

- **How should they be prioritised, taking account of their response to London's strategic transport challenges, including their impact on capacity, reliability, journey times and connectivity to jobs?**
- **What might their potential impact be on employment, productivity and housing supply in London and the southeast?**

Sustainability, improved air quality, improved health and efficiency and a better quality of life for Londoners must determine the transport priorities for London. Increased cycling levels address all of these issues and the well documented examples from the Netherlands and Denmark show how cycling can become the primary transport mode in a dense urban environment (see below for data) .

Prioritisation of walking , cycling and public transport enables cities to build more homes and allocate less scarce space to car parks and street car parking. A recent report (Minor Alterations to the London Plan) on the proposed minor increase in car parking levels in outer London shows that even this minor change may cost 260 fewer homes for Londoners each year.

Provision of high grade cycle facilities across the capital, and particularly in its major town centres, would enable more people to travel to work , education and leisure destinations more quickly and with health benefits to themselves.

Designing all transport interchanges to permit multi-modal transport can extend the 'active travel' catchment areas of stations fourfold reducing the need for car travel to stations and car parking at stations.

Dutch, and British, academic studies show that cyclists live longer, have higher fitness levels and show lower levels of absenteeism than people who have to choose other travel modes.

3. What opportunities are there to increase the benefits and reduce the costs of the proposed Crossrail 2 scheme?

LCC submitted the following comments to the preliminary Crossrail 2 consultation

The following are our general concerns regarding the potential benefits to and impacts on cycling, arising from Crossrail 2.

1. Crossrail 2 rolling stock design should ensure maximum possible capacity for cycling carriage. Many of the stations proposed are in areas with attractive leisure cycling potential, and a higher proportion of cycle carriage spaces would enable cyclists to more easily travel to and from central London outside of peak hours with their bicycles, access Crossrail 2 stations for leisure purposes and travel through London using Crossrail 2.
2. In Holland, around 40 percent of train passengers use bicycles to get to and from their local "home" train station. TfL has an opportunity to easily increase cycling

modal share in London, by ensuring Crossrail 2 stations feature exemplary, international levels and quality of cycle parking – built to anticipate future demand, rather than service current demand.

3. In a similar vein, it's also vital local councils involved and TfL give appropriate consideration to safe space for cycling on routes from surrounding residential areas and other suitable locations to access each station. In central London, the project offers significant opportunities to improve nearby main roads and routes lacking in appropriate cycling infrastructure.
4. Finally, such a large construction project will carry its own issues – in terms of HGV/lorry movements, construction sites and temporary site works. It's obviously important that everything that can be done to mitigate disruption and increased risks to cyclists from such issues is considered. We call on TfL to specify “direct vision” lorries for all Crossrail 2 construction (as well as ensuring operators are CLOCS compliant etc.), and to work with London Cycling Campaign and relevant local borough groups on a regular basis to ensure safety is maximised and disruption is minimised throughout the construction period.

4. What are the options for the funding, financing and delivery of large-scale transport infrastructure improvements in London, including Crossrail 2?

- **What is an appropriate local and regional contribution - given the potential distribution of benefits to business, residents, transport users and the wider economy - and how could this be achieved?**
- **What innovative funding mechanisms could be considered to support delivery of key schemes?**

In Dutch and Danish road schemes provision for cycling is integrated into projects from the start rather than tagged on as an, often expensive and disruptive, after measure. They also consistently adhere to well established and progressive cycle infrastructure design standards (the Dutch CROW Design Manual for Bicycle Traffic and the Danish Collection of Cycling Concepts are both translated into English) . London has recently published cycling design standards (London Cycle Design Standards and the accompanying Cycling Level of Service assessment) which include continental good practice, but these are not yet used consistently. The current UK cycle design standards lag behind the London ones and even they are not followed.

The Dutch and the Danes ensure that cycling measures are well funded, or incorporated into road modernisation, because they recognise that this investment saves costs on other infrastructure work, such as new roads or rail, which is significantly more expensive. This was recognised by the Eddington report on infrastructure for the UK Government which said that “Improving the attractiveness of walking and cycling, e.g. by creating or upgrading routes, can provide strong returns with wider BCRs sometimes over 10.” It also noted that “Well targeted smaller-scale walking and cycling schemes also have a beneficial impact on the environment due to the mode shift from car to these non-polluting modes.

The Dutch permit the use of car parking income to fund increased cycle parking provision.

As noted above, cycling infrastructure often does not need extra funding; rather, application of the road user hierarchy, TfL's Cycling Level of Service and London Cycle Design Standards to all traffic schemes, would enable cycling infrastructure to be realised as part of existing multi-billion pound road modernisation programmes.

5. How have major metropolitan areas in other countries responded to similar challenges and priorities? Are there any lessons to be learned and applied in London?

Cities in the Netherlands and Denmark are world leaders in the promotion and delivery of high levels of active and sustainable travel modes. This has the obvious benefits in terms of population health and air quality as well as reducing motor traffic congestion. Despite enjoying levels of cycling far higher than those in the UK continental cities continue to work towards growth in cycling.

In central Amsterdam the modal share of cycling is 50% while in the city as a whole cycling's modal share of journeys is more than a third. In Copenhagen the current modal share of cycling is 45% with an aspiration to exceed 50%.

Other cities with aspirations to be world leaders in terms of 'liveability' and sustainability are seeking to boost cycling use and improve their cycling infrastructure. New York, Paris, Seville, Barcelona, Bogota, Portland and others are all investing in their cycle infrastructure and reaping the benefits.