This is an update of the report published on 28 February 2018. It has been updated for postcode analysis and issues raised by respondents.
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Executive summary

Between 21 September and 31 October 2017 we consulted on proposals for Cycle Superhighway 9 (CS9) from Kensington Olympia to Brentford town centre. The consultation asked for feedback on the proposals from residents, businesses, employers, transport users and other relevant stakeholders. We publicised the consultation using leaflets distributed across a wide area, targeted email campaigns and via news stories in regional and local media.

This document explains the processes of the consultation, and provides an update on responses.

We received 5,388 direct responses to the consultation, of which 59 per cent supported or strongly supported the proposals, 2 per cent neither supported nor opposed the proposals, and 39 per cent opposed or strongly opposed the proposals.

93 of the responses were from key stakeholder groups, which comprised politicians, statutory bodies, employers, trade organisations, residents’ associations, developers, campaign groups, disability groups, and more. We have summarised the issues raised by these stakeholders in Appendix E.

An additional 941 template emails were received via the London Cycling Campaign website which strongly supported the overall proposals and made suggestions for further improvements. An additional 34 template emails were received from Sustrans which supported the proposals.

Many of the responses provided detailed feedback which we analysed in depth to ensure we understood views raised on the scheme.

Next steps

We have produced a detailed Response to Issues Raised report available on our website tfl.gov.uk/cs9
1. **About the proposals**

1.1 **Introduction**

In close consultation with our partners the London Borough of Hounslow and the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, we developed proposals to transform roads in west Kensington, Hammersmith, Chiswick and Brentford town centre to make cycling and walking easier, safer, and more appealing.

Cycle Superhighway 9 (CS9) would provide improvements for all road users and communities on the alignment, offering a clearer and safer route for people to cycle in west London, making it easier to cross busy roads and removing through traffic on some residential roads. Changing the layout of many of the roads along the CS9 route would create a more appealing environment for everyone to enjoy.

CS9 would form part of an emerging network of Cycle Superhighways. These are an important part of the Mayor's draft Transport Strategy and Healthy Streets Approach, which aim to encourage walking, cycling and using public transport, and make London greener, healthier and more pleasant.

1.2 **Purpose**

Cycle Superhighway 9 is designed to help us meet the target set out in the Mayor's draft Transport Strategy of changing the way people choose to travel so that 80 per cent of all London trips are made by foot, bicycle or public transport by 2041, up from 64 per cent today.

Over 3000 trips are already being made daily by people who cycle on some of the streets where improvements are proposed. In addition, areas of this route in Chiswick, Hammersmith and Kensington Olympia have some of the highest concentration of pedestrians in the city. Along the A205 South Circular section of CS9 by Kew Bridge Station, cycling is up nearly six fold and all motor traffic is down by over 20 per cent since 2000. Across London, there are now more than 670,000 cycle trips a day, an increase of over 130 per cent since 2000, making cycling a major mode of transport in the capital.

1.2.1 **Improving safety for people who want to walk and cycle**

CS9 would provide a clearer and safer route for cycling in west London, largely separated from other vehicles. This alignment provides a direct route in the heart of town centres in west London, with good connectivity to other local roads.

Roads on the alignment are currently dominated by motor traffic and can be intimidating and unpleasant places to walk and cycle. Walking and cycling are the
healthiest and most sustainable ways to travel, either for whole trips or as part of longer journeys on public transport.

By giving people space and time to cycle through the area more easily, and by providing improved crossing facilities for pedestrians, we can encourage more people to use these healthy and sustainable forms of transport while keeping other traffic moving. These improvements would help to make these streets work better for walking, cycling and public transport, so both individuals and the community as a whole can benefit.

1.2.2 Facilitating and encouraging active travel in west London

We want to make it easier for people in west London to use sustainable travel and lead active lifestyles. We also want to make the streets on the CS9 alignment healthier, safer and more welcoming places for everyone. The proposals form part of the Mayor of London’s plan for Healthy Streets a long-term vision to encourage more Londoners to walk, cycle and use public transport by making London’s streets healthier, safer and more welcoming.

Currently, only 34 per cent of Londoners take 20 minutes of physical activity on any given day. The new cycle facilities would help to encourage people to use active modes of transport, which could achieve significant health benefits. The proposals aim to encourage people who would like to cycle, but currently feel unable to do so.


Data from existing Cycle Superhighways suggest the new route would also draw cyclists away from other routes that are less suitable for them. The introduction of the East-West and North-South Cycle Superhighways in central London has seen significant increases in cycling as a mode of transport.

1.2.3 Connecting and improving town centres

Our proposals would help connect town centres from Kensington Olympia through Hammersmith, Chiswick and Brentford, linking important amenities and facilities in the heart of these town centres, and making them more pleasant places to live, work, shop and spend time.

To make it easier to cross busy roads here, we would install five new pedestrian crossings and upgrade over 20 others. We would also install new seating areas to provide space for people to stop, rest and spend time along the route. This would be supported by other improvements to the street environment, including new trees.
As well as enabling more Londoners to walk and cycle more often, these proposals would help to create more welcoming and inclusive streets.

1.3 Detailed description

We published detailed proposals on our website at tfl.gov.uk/cs9. There, we provided an overview of the scheme, along with maps and computer-generated images showing how the roads would look if CS9 were implemented.

Due to the length of the scheme, we divided the route up into 10 sections, each with their own explanations and maps.

Our survey asked for levels of support or opposition for the overall scheme, and for each section. We invited comments on the overall proposals and individual sections, as well as for a possible future extension of the route from Brentford to Hounslow town centre.

The summary text of our consultation proposals is reproduced in Appendix A. The full consultation material (including section summaries, traffic impacts, maps and images) will remain available at tfl.gov.uk/cs9
2. About the consultation

2.1 Purpose

The objectives of the consultation were:

- To give stakeholders and the public easily-understood information about the proposals and allow them to respond
- To understand the level of support or opposition for the proposals
- To understand any issues or impacts that might affect the proposals of which we were not previously aware
- To understand concerns and objections
- To allow respondents to make suggestions

2.2 Potential outcomes

The potential outcomes of this and any other consultation are:

- Following careful consideration of the consultation responses, we decide to proceed with the scheme as set out in the consultation
- Following careful consideration of the consultation responses, we modify the proposals in response to issues raised and proceed with a revised scheme
- Following careful consideration of the consultation responses, we decide not to proceed with the scheme

2.3 Consultation history

Previous consultations on measures to improve some of these streets have already taken place.

Hammersmith Gyratory

In January 2017, TfL approved proposals to create dedicated space for cyclists on the northern side of Hammersmith gyratory with the support of Hammersmith & Fulham Council. More information on the Hammersmith gyratory consultation that took place in spring 2016 is available at https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/hammersmith-gyratory/

Our proposals for CS9 would enhance the benefits provided by this scheme by extending the two-way cycle track on King Street to ensure cyclists do not have to mix with general traffic when travelling westbound through the area.

We have listened to residents’ concerns over the reduction in capacity for general traffic on Beadon Road. We have updated our proposal here to ensure traffic can flow more freely through the junction with Hammersmith Grove. We would do this by
signalising the junction of Beadon Road and Hammersmith Grove. Currently, vehicles exiting Hammersmith Grove and pedestrians crossing Beadon Road are uncontrolled. This can constrain the amount of traffic on Beadon Road that can flow into Hammersmith Gyratory. Controlling these movements with traffic signals would increase capacity for general traffic on Beadon Road which is the principal route for through traffic here.

This revised design would also allow us to provide a new signal-controlled pedestrian crossing over Beadon Road on the western arm of the junction, which would accommodate growth from surrounding developments. This would also provide enough time for vehicles making local trips to exit Hammersmith Grove and join Beadon Road.

In addition, no new bus lane is proposed on Beadon Road in this design. This means more space for general traffic is retained for approximately 170 metres where bus lane had previously been proposed, but results in longer journeys for people travelling by bus. Click here for detailed traffic impacts of the proposals, including a comparison with the consulted scheme at Hammersmith Gyratory.

We remain committed to delivering improvements at Hammersmith Gyratory. Subject to the outcome of this consultation, we would look to deliver these improvements as part of CS9. We intend to start construction of all improvements in Hammersmith Gyratory in late 2018, subject to the outcome of this consultation, any subsequent follow-up consultations and agreeing proposals with partner boroughs.

**Wellesley Road (traffic reduction)**

In summer 2016, the London Borough of Hounslow carried out a survey on traffic issues with residents and businesses in the Wellesley Road and Stile Hall Gardens area. The responses received indicated high levels of concern at the volume of through traffic – 73 per cent responded that there is too much non-residential traffic in the area - and the impact of this on several issues including road safety, attractiveness of the road for walking and cycling and pollution.

In late 2016, LB Hounslow consulted on proposals to reduce through traffic in the area. The majority of respondents (55 per cent) were in favour of a closure/no entry to restrict access, and closing access to the South Circular from Wellesley Road and Stile Hall Gardens was the favoured change option (48 per cent, or 87 per cent of all responses in favour of change).

**A3320 Warwick Road Safety Scheme**

In 2016, TfL consulted on proposals to improve pedestrian and cycling facilities around the junction of Kensington High Street with Warwick Road and Addison Road. These improvements are unaffected by CS9 proposals and we are currently constructing these on site.
2.4 Who we consulted

We consulted the public, businesses and stakeholders in the London Boroughs of Hounslow, Hammersmith & Fulham and the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea about our proposals. We worked closely with our partner boroughs to ensure information about the consultation reached as wide an audience as possible.

- We delivered letters to local residents and businesses located on or close to the proposed route informing them about the consultation.
- To raise awareness among motorists, cyclists, bus users and other public transport users we emailed people who we knew used the route or lived nearby (identified from our customer database).
- We sent emails to stakeholders likely to be interested in the proposals, including disability groups, organisations representing the elderly, transport user groups, businesses and major employers, trade organisations, statutory organisations, charities, local government, politicians, residents’ and tenants’ associations, amenity societies, healthcare providers, sports clubs and educational establishments, amongst others.
- We provided information about the proposals and the consultation via local and regional media.

For a full list of the channels used, please go to Section 2.8 below.

Maps of the distribution areas for letters to local residents and a list of stakeholders can be found in Appendices C and E respectively.

During the consultation period, we also conducted face-to-face interviews with over 600 businesses located along the proposed route to get more in-depth knowledge of their operational requirements for goods deliveries and collections.

2.5 Dates and duration

The consultation ran for nearly six weeks from 21 September to 31 October 2017.

2.6 What we asked

We asked people to tell us what they thought both about the overall proposals and the individual sections of the route that were of interest to them.

Only Question 1 – asking about the respondent’s level of support for the overall proposals required a mandatory response. Here we asked people to select an answer (‘strongly support’, ‘support’, ‘neither support nor oppose’, ‘oppose’, ‘strongly oppose’) that matched their level of support for (or opposition to) the proposals.
We also invited them to comment on the overall proposals via a free text response box. This question was optional as were all other questions.

We followed the same pattern for each of the ten sections of the route. We asked respondents to select the answer (‘strongly support’, ‘support’, ‘neither support nor oppose’ ‘oppose’, ‘strongly oppose’) that most closely matched their views on that section of the proposed route. We also invited them to comment via a free text response box.

Respondents were also asked to submit their name, email address and postcode, along with information about their cycling and other travel habits.

Other information, such as the respondent’s IP address and the date and time of responding, was recorded automatically.

All data is held under conditions that conform to the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998.

A full list of questions asked as part of the consultation is available in appendix B.

### 2.7 Methods of responding

People were able to respond to the consultation by:

- answering the questions in the survey on our consultation website at [tfl.gov.uk/cs9](http://tfl.gov.uk/cs9)
- sending a letter to FREEPOST TfL CONSULTATIONS
- emailing us at [consultations@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:consultations@tfl.gov.uk). The Consultation Team also answered questions from members of the public and stakeholders via email
- phoning our Customer Service Team. The team were briefed on CS9 to ensure they could answer questions and take responses. They forwarded any questions they were unable to answer to the Consultation Team for response
- leaving comments and/or filling in questionnaires at one of the public drop-in sessions (or posting a questionnaire to the address above)

Foreign language translations, large print, Braille or audio versions of our consultation materials could be requested from our Customer Services Team.

### 2.8 Consultation materials and publicity

We used a range of channels to raise awareness of the consultation and ensure that members of the public and stakeholders were aware of its purposes.
All materials encouraged interested parties to visit our website or contact us to find out more about the scheme and how to respond.

2.8.1 Website
The website (tfl.gov.uk/cs9) provided detailed information about the consultation, including overview maps, drawings and computer-generated images. It was divided into pages:

- showing an overview of the scheme,
- explaining the separate sections of the route,
- giving in-depth information about journey impacts for motor traffic, pedestrians impacts and bus services.

The website provided people with the opportunity to respond to the consultation by answering our questionnaire.

2.8.2 Letters
Letters informing people about the consultation, accompanied by an overview map, were sent to over 70,000 addresses adjacent to the proposed route for CS9 on 21 September 2017. Since the area covered by the proposals was almost 8 miles long - extending from Kensington to Hounslow - we created three tailored versions of the letter specifically for residents living in:

- West Kensington and Hammersmith
- Chiswick and Brentford
- Isleworth and Hounslow

Copies of the letters and a map of the distribution area can be found in Appendix C.

2.8.3 Emails to public
We sent an email about the consultation to over 230,000 people who live locally or use our transport services in the area.

The data for the distribution list was extracted from our master database of those who have registered their details with us – for example Oyster Card and Contactless customers, as well as road users such as Congestion Charge, Cycle Hire and registered Cyclists. The text of the email is reproduced in Appendix D.

2.8.4 Public meetings, events and exhibitions

Public drop-in events
During the consultation period we held 11 public drop-in events at times and locations designed to capture a broad audience of attendees. At each event, staff
from TfL and partner boroughs were available to answer questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Date and time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chiswick Town Hall, Heathfield Terrace, Chiswick</td>
<td>Tuesday 26 September 1700–2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Grove House, West Thames College, Isleworth</td>
<td>Thursday 28 September 1700-2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove Neighbourhood Centre, Bradmore Park Road, Hammersmith</td>
<td>Sunday 1 October 1100-1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pilot, Wellesley Road, Chiswick</td>
<td>Monday 2 October 1700-2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s Church Hall, Edith Road, West Kensington</td>
<td>Thursday 5 October 1600-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyric Square, King Street, Hammersmith</td>
<td>Friday 6 October 1100-1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiswick High Road, footway by Bleak House Lane, Chiswick</td>
<td>Saturday 7 October 1100-1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Keys, Black Lion Lane, Hammersmith</td>
<td>Wednesday 11 October 1700-2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watermans Art Centre, 40 High Street, Brentford</td>
<td>Saturday 14 October 1100-1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentford Market, Market Place, Brentford</td>
<td>Sunday 15 October 1000-1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenscourt Park (adjacent to the teahouse)</td>
<td>Sunday 22 October 1100-1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also presented information about the proposals at:

- a breakfast briefing for local businesses held by Hammersmith BID
- an evening debate organised by The Chiswick Calendar
- Chiswick Area Forum
- Isleworth & Brentford Area Forum

### 2.8.5 Meetings with stakeholders

We met with a number of stakeholders to discuss the plans, update them on the scheme and discuss other aspects of the proposals. These meetings took place before and during the consultation. The stakeholders we met included:

#### Political
- Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea - officers
- Cllrs Carlebach (LBHF)
- Cllrs Todd, Hearn, MacGregor, Curran, Lambert, Collins and Savin (LBH)
- Ruth Cadbury MP

**Transport**
- Brewery Logistics Group
- Cab Ranks Committee
- Ealing Cycling Campaign
- Freight Trade Association
- Hammersmith & Fulham Cycling Campaign
- Hounslow Cycling Campaign
- London Cycling Campaign
- MPS - Abnormal Loads unit
- Road Haulage Association

**Local and residential**
- British Grove residents
- Chiswick High Road Action Group
- Chiswick Area Forum
- Isleworth & Brentford Area Forum
- LB Hounslow Disabled User Group
- Our Lady of Grace and St Edward Roman Catholic Church, Chiswick
- Rivercourt Methodist Church (Hammersmith)

**Cultural, heritage**
- Hammersmith Society (committee members)

**Businesses**
- Olympia Exhibition Centre (with Yoo Capital and Momentum Transport)
- Hammersmith BID (Business Improvement District)
- Travis Perkins

### 2.8.5 Market Research with local businesses
During the consultation period, we also conducted face-to-face interviews with over 600 businesses located along the proposed route to get more in-depth knowledge of their operational requirements for goods deliveries and collections.

### 2.8.6 Press and media activity
A press release was distributed to local and regional media at the time the consultation launched. It generated news stories in the Metro and Standard amongst others.

### 2.8.7 Print and digital advertising
We advertised the consultation in local print newspapers appearing in the consultation area, namely:
• Kensington, Chelsea & Westminster Today
• Ealing Gazette
• Richmond Twickenham Times
• The Chronicle & Informer (Hounslow)

It also featured as part of TfL’s weekly ‘travel news’ advertorial feature in the Metro

A copy of the advertisements can be found in Appendix D.

2.8.8 Digital Advertising

We advertised the consultation digitally to mobile devices on 3/4G and WiFi (home and business) within specified postcodes - SW5, W14, W6, W12, W14, W4 and TW8. Users could click through from the advertisement to find out more.

A copy of the advertisements can be found in Appendix D.

2.8.9 Social Media

Campaigns for and against the proposal used social media to highlight their views. Twitter users discussed and retweeted views and opinions about the scheme, and some put forward suggested answers to consultation questions. Facebook pages were used by some people to debate the pros and cons of the scheme.

2.9 How we considered equalities in the consultation

We took steps to ensure that groups in the community, such as elderly, disabled or faith organisations were made aware of the proposals, their potential impacts and how to respond to the consultation. Measures taken included:

• Identifying and emailing relevant stakeholders such as British Dyslexia Association, Age UK London, Guide Dogs, Royal National Institute for the Blind, Action on Hearing Loss and Inclusion London, inviting them to respond to the consultation
• Ensuring that the materials were written in plain English, and available on request in different formats (for example, Braille, large print, other languages)
• Making sure that public events were held in accessible locations and at different times of the day and that large scale materials were available to review
• Considering how best to reach our target audiences and tailoring the way of communicating with them. For example, by preparing hard copies of our online material for those not able to access our website

We are fully aware of our obligations under the Equality Act 2010, in particular the effect of the public sector equality duty on our decision-making. Some responses to consultation raised issues relating to equalities. We are currently analysing detailed
feedback in all responses to determine the best way forward. All issues raised will be considered and we will continue to discuss the scheme with stakeholders. We will publish a full consultation report, which will include a detailed response to the issues raised and our next steps, later in 2018.

2.10 Analysis of consultation responses

We commissioned Steer Davies Gleave (SDG) to analyse the consultation responses. All closed questions were reviewed and the results tabulated and reported.

All open questions, where respondents provided comments on the overall scheme or parts of it, are currently being analysed in detail. Each individual comment is being attributed with one or more codes according to the issues raised. This information is also checked and verified by the TfL Consultation Team.

Where more than one response had been submitted from the same person, these responses are combined before the data is analysed. Throughout this process we are mindful of our responsibilities under the Data Protection Act.
3. **About the respondents**

This chapter provides more information on respondents to this consultation, based on the information they provided to us in our questionnaire. For a full list of the consultation questions, see Appendix B.

### 3.1 Number of respondents

Once any duplicate responses had been removed, there were 5,388 direct respondents. Duplicates can occur, for example, when the same person responds by email and online or when the same person responds twice online. When duplicates were identified, we combined the two responses. We processed 107 duplicates in this consultation.

Stakeholder responses are those submitted by individuals who identify themselves as representing political entities, organisations, businesses or campaign groups. Their responses are summarised in Appendix E.

An additional 941 template emails were received via the London Cycling Campaign website which strongly supported the overall proposals and made suggestions for further improvements. An additional 34 template emails were received from Sustrans which supported the proposals. These campaigns are described in more detail in Section 4.13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public responses</td>
<td>5,295</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder responses</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 How respondents heard about the consultation

We asked respondents to tell us how they heard about the consultation. A total of 4,875 (90% of all respondents) provided an answer. Percentages are given as a proportion of the total number of respondents to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heard about the consultation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received an email from TfL</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received a letter from TfL</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By word of mouth</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On social media like Twitter or Facebook</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read about it in the press</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through a community</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group/event/meeting</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a local newsletter</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through a residents’ group/forum/meeting</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw it on the TfL website</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw the postcard about it</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From local councillors</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended an event</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw a poster or banner or advert about it</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From TfL on the street/in the station</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Methods of responding

We accepted responses via our online survey; directly by email to consultations@tfl.gov.uk or our Customer Services Team; and via letter or response form sent to our FREEPOST address.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of responding</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>4,997</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email, letters and paper response forms</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4  Respondent postcodes, postcode districts and postcode sectors

Of the 5,388 respondents to the consultation, 4,523 (84% of all respondents) submitted their postcode. We received responses from 2,846 unique postcodes.

We received responses from 379 postcode districts. Below we have listed all postcode districts provided by 20 or more respondents. Percentages are given as a proportion of the total number of respondents providing their postcode.

Appendix F shows the level of support and opposition to the overall proposals by postcode district and sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postcode district</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W14</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW8</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W12</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW7</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW9</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We received responses from 724 postcode sectors. Below we have listed all postcode sectors provided by 20 or more respondents. Percentages are given as a proportion of the total number of respondents providing their postcode.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postcode sector</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W4 2</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 1</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 3</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 4</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 5</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6 0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6 9</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW8 0</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W12 9</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W14 0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W14 8</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6 7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W14 9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW8 8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW7 6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3 8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3 7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5 4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W13 9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW8 9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW7 5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5 3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW9 2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW13 9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3 9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W12 8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW7 4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Relationship between respondent and scheme area

We asked respondents to describe their relationship to the scheme area using the categories below, with respondents encouraged to tick one or more categories. 7,297 categories were provided by 5,245 respondents (97% of all respondents). The table below shows a breakdown of these. Percentages are given as a proportion of the total number of respondents to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of respondent</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local resident</td>
<td>3,940</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter to/from/through the area</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor to the area</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed locally</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not local but interested in the scheme</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local business owner</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi/private hire vehicle driver</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 Modes of transport

We asked respondents to tell us what modes of transport they usually use to travel locally and to tick all options that apply. 5,030 answered this question (93% of all respondents), with a total of 18,172 modes recorded. Percentages are given as a proportion of the total number of respondents to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of transport</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tube</td>
<td>3353</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle</td>
<td>3293</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>3033</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private car</td>
<td>2821</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk/wheelchair</td>
<td>2707</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>1483</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle/powered two-wheeler</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorry</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Quality of the consultation

We asked respondents to tell us what they thought of the quality of the consultation, for example the information we have provided, any printed material they have received, any maps or plans, the website and questionnaire. Options to answer were: Very good, Good, Acceptable, Poor, Very poor.

4,863 respondents answered this question (90% of all respondents). Percentages are given as a proportion of the total number of respondents to this question.
We asked respondents to provide comments on the quality of consultation. 950 (18 per cent) respondents answered this question. Below we report the most significant issues raised. For detailed analysis of the comments on the consultation, see appendix G.

- Some respondents said that there was a lack of publicity for the consultation, or that the notification period for the drop-in sessions was too short
- Some respondents said that the consultation material was hard to navigate. Concerns included that there was too much information, notably when accessing by a phone, that there should have been links from the questionnaire to the section proposals and suggestions to have a single PDF with all the information
- Some respondents said that the maps, diagrams and drawings could be clearer to follow, or larger, or that there should be more images
- Some respondents considered that the proposals will be implemented regardless of public opinion
- Some respondents considered that the consultation period was too short
- Some respondents considered that more detail about the scheme should have been provided in the consultation materials
- Some respondents rated the consultation materials positively, for example stating that the materials were good or clear or well set out
- Some respondents considered that the diagrams and drawings provided misleading images
- Some respondents considered that the presentation of information about the proposals was misleading
- Some respondents were positive overall about the consultation
4 Summary of responses to closed questions

4.1 About this chapter

To gain feedback on the scheme, we asked respondents 11 closed questions, allowing them to show their level of support for the overall scheme and for each of the sections. This section sets out the overall results of responses to these closed questions.

There is an analysis of the question on support for our overall proposals by postcode and borough.

We also asked 12 open questions which allowed respondents to comment on the overall scheme and each of the sections. The ten most frequently made comments are summarised in this section. Appendix G has a full analysis of these comments. We are continuing to consider our response to the issues raised and we will publish a summary of these responses later this year.

Stakeholder responses are included in all results in this chapter, and percentages are calculated from the number of respondents for each question. Only the question asking for the level of support for the overall scheme was mandatory for online respondents.

An additional 941 template emails were received via the London Cycling Campaign website which strongly supported the overall proposals and made suggestions for further improvements. An additional 34 template emails were received from Sustrans which supported the proposals. See section 4.13.
4.2 Support for overall proposals and individual sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither support nor oppose / Not sure</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2849</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith Road</td>
<td>2118</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith Gyratory</td>
<td>2095</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beadon Road</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street (East)</td>
<td>2034</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street (West)</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiswick High Road</td>
<td>2126</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathfield Terr / Wellesley Rd</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Circular (Kew Bridge)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kew Bridge Rd / Watermans Park / Brentford High St</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentford High St (West)</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Q1: Do you support our overall proposals?

All 5,388 respondents answered this question by expressing their level of support for the overall proposals. Options to answer were: Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose.

If respondents did not provide an answer to this question (because they submitted an email or letter rather than using the online questionnaire) and there was an obvious support or otherwise for the scheme, our analysts inferred a response based on the comments provided.
Q1: Do you support our overall proposals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>2849</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oppose</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>1589</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maps showing levels of support for overall proposals

4.3.1 Respondents supporting overall proposals across Greater London
4.3.2 Respondents opposing overall proposals across Greater London
4.3.3 Respondents supporting overall proposals near the proposed route
4.3.4 Respondents opposing overall scheme near the proposed route
Cycle Superhighway 9 Consultation Analysis
Respondent postcode who oppose overall scheme
4.3.5 Overall support for the proposals by borough

The number of respondents by borough answering the question on the overall support for the proposals is shown in the graph below.

![Graph showing overall support by borough]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other London Boroughs</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The level of support and opposition for the scheme by London borough is shown in the graph below.
4.3.6 Question 2: “Do you have any comments on the overall proposals”

3,872 respondents provided comments on the overall proposals for CS9. The table below shows the ten most frequently raised issues in their responses. Detailed analysis of all open questions can be found in Appendix G.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motorists</td>
<td>Concern proposals will increase congestion</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of scheme</td>
<td>Support encouraging more people to cycle</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Suggest alternative route along A4</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Concern that pollution will increase as result of congestion</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on cyclists</td>
<td>Support scheme as it will make cycling safer</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of scheme</td>
<td>Oppose prioritising cyclists over other transport modes</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Support scheme due to air quality benefits</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic impacts</td>
<td>Concern the scheme would damage the local economy</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on pedestrians</td>
<td>Concern Cycle Superhighways pose danger to pedestrians due to speed of cyclists/ proximity of pavement to cycle tracks</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic impacts</td>
<td>Concern over costs of scheme</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Q3: Do you support the proposals for Hammersmith Road?

4,716 respondents answered this question giving their level of support for proposals for Hammersmith Road. Options to answer were: Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose, Not sure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern proposals will increase congestion</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern over current levels of congestion in general</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern removal of traffic lanes or reallocation of road space will increase congestion</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Concern that proposals will worsen air quality</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Suggest whole route should be segregated without interruptions</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of scheme</td>
<td>Oppose scheme, changes are not needed to accommodate cyclists</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of scheme</td>
<td>Concern that scheme doesn't connect to cycle network</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Support segregated cycle lanes</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on bus users</td>
<td>Concern bus journey times will increase</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of scheme</td>
<td>Suggest scheme should be extended to Kensington/Chelsea/Kings Road</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.1 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for Hammersmith Road”

1,125 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Hammersmith Road. The table below shows the ten most frequently raised issues. Detailed analysis of all open questions is contained in Appendix G.
4.5 Q4: Do you support the proposals for Hammersmith Gyratory?

4656 respondents answered this question giving their level of support for the proposals for Hammersmith Gyratory. Options to answer were: Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose.

![Bar chart showing responses](chart.png)

Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither Support nor Oppose</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2095</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

%  
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4.5.1 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for Hammersmith Gyratory?”

983 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Hammersmith Gyratory. The table below shows the ten most frequently raised issues. Detailed analysis of all open questions is contained in Appendix G.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Concern current gyratory layout is unsafe and unpleasant to use</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern proposals will increase congestion</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern about current levels of congestion</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Concern current cycling conditions are unsatisfactory</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on cyclists</td>
<td>Support scheme as it will make cycling safer</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of scheme</td>
<td>Suggest further tracks to improve north/south links to the gyratory</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern at removal of traffic lanes</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Concern traffic delay sequencing should not delay cyclists</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Concern that pollution will increase as result of congestion</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Support proposals due to safety benefits for all road users</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on bus users</td>
<td>Concern about delays to bus journeys from the scheme at the gyratory</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6   Q5: Do you support the proposals for Beadon Road?

4,850 respondents answered this question giving their level of support for the proposals for Beadon Road. Options to answer were: Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose.

![Graph showing support levels for Beadon Road proposals]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor oppose</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.1 “Do you have any comments about the proposals for Beadon Road?”

515 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Beadon Road. The table below shows the ten most frequently raised issues in their responses. Detailed analysis of all open questions is contained in Appendix G.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern proposals will increase congestion</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern over current levels of congestion</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junctions</td>
<td>Support signalised crossings on Beadon Road</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Concern that proposals will worsen air quality</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Suggest the whole route should be segregated</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on bus users</td>
<td>Concern over increased bus journey times</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on bus users</td>
<td>Suggest addition of bus lanes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Suggest alternative route along A4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of scheme</td>
<td>Oppose scheme, changes are not needed to accommodate cyclists</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Suggest a bus stop bypass with segregated cycle lane at Hammersmith Station</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junctions</td>
<td>Oppose narrowing at Hammersmith Grove junction</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7 Q6: Do you support the proposals for King Street (East)?

4,630 respondents answered this question giving their level of support for the proposals for King Street (East). Options to answer were: Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose.

![Bar chart showing support levels for King Street proposals]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>2034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor oppose</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7.1 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for King Street (East)?

694 respondents provided comments on the proposals for King Street (East). The table below shows the ten most frequently raised issues in their responses. Detailed analysis of all open questions is contained in Appendix G.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern proposals will increase congestion</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Suggest alternative route along A4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Concern that the proposals would worsen air pollution</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Concern that the road and pavement are too narrow for the proposals</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern over current levels of congestion</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on pedestrians</td>
<td>Concern scheme will negatively impact pedestrians</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on pedestrians</td>
<td>Concern that it makes the area less safe for pedestrians</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of the scheme</td>
<td>Oppose prioritising cyclists</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on bus users</td>
<td>Concerned proposals will increase bus journey times</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on pedestrians</td>
<td>Concern that pavements are already very narrow</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8 Q7: Do you support the proposals for King Street (West)?

4,658 respondents answered this question giving their level of support for the proposals for King Street (West). Options to answer were: *Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Level</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor oppose</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.1 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for King Street (West)?”

688 respondents provided comments on the proposals for King Street (West). The table below shows the ten most frequently raised issues in their responses. Detailed analysis of all open questions is contained in Appendix G.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern proposals will increase congestion</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Suggest alternative route along A4</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on pedestrians</td>
<td>Concern that it makes the area less safe for pedestrians</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Concern that proposals will worsen air quality</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern over current levels of congestion</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclist behaviour</td>
<td>Concern over speeding cyclists</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on pedestrians</td>
<td>Concern over the reduction in walking space</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on bus users</td>
<td>Concern over increased bus journey times</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Concern the roads and pavements are too narrow for the proposals</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junctions</td>
<td>Concern over access proposals for British Grove</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.9 Q8: Do you support the proposals for Chiswick High Road?

4,999 respondents answered this question giving their level of support for the proposals for Chiswick High Road. Options to answer were: Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q8: Do you support the proposals for Chiswick High Road?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents: Strongly support 2126, Support 815, Neither support nor oppose 159, Oppose 244, Strongly oppose 1655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%: 43%, 16%, 3%, 5%, 33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9.1 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for Chiswick High Road?”

1,959 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Chiswick High Road. The table below shows the ten most frequently raised issues in their responses. Detailed analysis of all open questions is contained in Appendix G.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern proposals will increase congestion</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on pedestrians</td>
<td>Concern about the impact of proposals on vulnerable people</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of scheme</td>
<td>Concern history/tradition/feel of area will be negatively affected</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Suggest alternative route along the A4</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic impacts</td>
<td>Concern the proposals will negatively impact the businesses of Chiswick</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on pedestrians</td>
<td>Concern the proposals would increase the safety risk to pedestrians</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclist behaviour</td>
<td>Concern speeding cyclists pose a danger to pedestrians</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern about existing levels of congestion</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on pedestrians</td>
<td>Concern that scheme will increase pedestrian/cyclists conflict</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic impacts</td>
<td>Concern over loss of street/café culture</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on churches</td>
<td>Concern about impacts of narrowing pavement outside Our Lady &amp; St Edward's Church</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q9: Do you support the proposals for Heathfield Terrace / Wellesley Road?

4,772 respondents answered this question giving their level of support for the proposals for Heathfield Terrace / Wellesley Road. Options to answer were: Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor oppose</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>1113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.10.1 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for Heathfield Terrace/Wellesley Road?”

1,171 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Heathfield Terrace/Wellesley Road. The table below shows the ten most frequently raised issues in their responses. Detailed analysis of all open questions is contained in Appendix G.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern proposals will increase congestion</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Suggest the whole route should be segregated</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern over current levels of congestion</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junctions</td>
<td>Oppose restricting access to South Circular from Wellesley Road</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Concern that pollution will increase as result of congestion</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junctions</td>
<td>Concern proposed mini roundabout inadequate or unsafe</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Support proposals as they reduce through traffic</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junctions</td>
<td>Concern that closing the South Circular will force more traffic onto Chiswick High Road</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Concern that the road and pavement are too narrow for the proposals</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Suggested route alignment along the A4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10: Do you support the proposals for the South Circular Road (Kew Bridge Station)?

4671 respondents answered this question giving their level of support for the proposals for the South Circular Road (Kew Bridge Station). Options to answer were: Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor oppose</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.11.1 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for the South Circular Road (Kew Bridge Station)?”

985 respondents provided comments on the proposals for the South Circular Road (Kew Bridge Station). The table below shows the ten most frequently raised issues in their responses. Detailed analysis of all open questions is contained in Appendix G.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern over current levels of congestion</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Concern about cyclist safety at bus stop at Kew Bridge station</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern proposals will increase congestion</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Suggest more consideration for getting cyclists safely on and off the bridge</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on cyclists</td>
<td>Concern current route is unsafe/unsatisfactory to use</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Suggest a bus stop bypass with segregated cycle track at Kew Bridge station</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junctions</td>
<td>Suggest cyclists travelling along Capital Interchange Way should be able to join CS9 in either direction</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Concern over current levels of pollution caused by stationary traffic</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Oppose stopping access to the South Circular for motorists at Wellesley Road</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on pedestrians</td>
<td>Support new crossings, including at Kew Bridge station</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.12 Q11: Do you support the proposals for Kew Bridge Road / Watermans Park / Brentford High Street (East)?

4,627 respondents answered this question giving their level of support for the proposals for Kew Bridge Road / Watermans Park / Brentford High Street (East). Options to answer were: Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose.

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses to Q11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor oppose</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.12.1 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for Kew Bridge Road/ Watermans Park/ Brentford High Street (East)?”

623 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Kew Bridge Road/ Watermans Park/ Brentford High Street (East). The table below shows the ten most frequently raised issues in their responses. Detailed analysis of all open questions is contained in Appendix G.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Suggest further segregation of cycle tracks</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern about the impact of proposals on congestion</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern about existing levels of congestion</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Oppose plans to route the track through Waterman's Park</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Concern about the difference in elevation between road and park path</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Concern that the road and pavement are too narrow for the proposal</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Support the use of the park for the cycle track</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Concern proposals will decrease safety for all road users</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Suggestions for alternative routes</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of scheme</td>
<td>Support proposals as they will increase the uptake of cycling</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.13 Q12: Do you support the proposals for Brentford High Street (West)?

464 respondents answered this question giving their level of support for the proposals for Brentford High Street (West). Options to answer were: *Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose.*

![Chart showing level of support for the proposals for Brentford High Street (West).]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Support</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor oppose</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.13.1 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for Brentford High Street (West)?”

464 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Brentford High Street (West). The table below shows the ten most frequently raised issues in their responses. Detailed analysis of all open questions is contained in Appendix G.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern proposals will increase congestion and increase journey times</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern over current levels of congestion</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Concern that proposals will lead to congestion and increase pollution</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on bus users</td>
<td>Concern over increased bus journey times</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of the scheme</td>
<td>Oppose scheme, changes are not needed to accommodate cyclists</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Suggest alternative route along A4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern at the removal of traffic lanes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Concern that the road and pavement are too narrow for the proposals</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Support further segregated cycle lanes</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclist behaviour</td>
<td>Concern over speeding cyclists</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on cyclists</td>
<td>Support the scheme as it will make cycling safer</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.14 Q13. “Do you have any comments on future proposals for CS9 from Brentford High Street to Hounslow town centre?”

1,093 respondents provided comments on the proposals for future proposals for CS9 from Brentford High Street to Hounslow town centre. The table below shows the ten most frequently raised issues in their responses. Detailed analysis of all open questions is contained in Appendix G.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timescales</td>
<td>Suggest scheme is implemented as soon as possible</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Suggest whole route should be segregated without interruptions</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of scheme</td>
<td>Support scheme as it will encourage cycling uptake</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern over current levels of congestion</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on motor traffic</td>
<td>Concern proposals will increase congestion</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of scheme</td>
<td>Support improved cycle links to rest of London</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Suggest a link to Hounslow</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle infrastructure</td>
<td>Suggest link to Heathrow</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic impacts</td>
<td>Concern over the costs of the scheme and/or it is a waste of money</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on pedestrians</td>
<td>Concern the proposals will impact safety of pedestrians</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>Support the scheme as it will reduce congestion</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.13 Campaigns

London Cycling Campaign

An additional 941 template emails were received via the London Cycling Campaign website. These emails:

- Strongly supported the overall proposals

- Considered it is vital west London gets a Cycle Superhighway along this route – enabling far more people to cycle and walk to local shops and amenities and to and from central London. Asked that the scheme be improved with safer junctions (particularly the side roads), and wider tracks (ideally “with flow”), and extended to go all the way to Hounslow (and Heathrow) and to link to the East-West Cycle Superhighway through Kensington & Chelsea. Asked that more consideration given to linking to the key destinations and amenities on the route and nearby, so more children can ride to school, more people can ride to the places they need to be.

- Supported the proposals for Hammersmith Road, but considered the section in Kensington & Chelsea needs cycle tracks. Considered more space for cycling and walking could be achieved by removing pedestrian refuges (replacing them with proper crossings) and turning lanes. Considered bidirectional tracks, side-road crossings are a major concern – either tracks should be “with flow” or these junctions need more thought to make them safer, including potentially area-wide “modal filter cell” treatments for the areas accessed through the side streets.

- Supported the proposals for Hammersmith Gyratory. Considered the design of the cycle track where it passes through the King Street/Beadon Road to Hammersmith Broadway crossing is of particular concern, given how long it will take for cyclists to pass through the area with the light sequencing. Considered some of the junctions in this section will be complex to navigate while cycling.

- Supported the proposals for Beadon Road. Considered in the long term, more needs to be done – probably separate space for cycling, and a modal filter area-wide approach for Hammersmith Grove and beyond.

- Supported the proposals for King Street (East). Considered more needs to be done to ensure crossing Leamore Street is safe. Considered the track should be wider, and ideally “with flow”.

- Supported the proposals for King Street (West). Considered more needs to be done with side road junctions to keep people safe using bidirectional cycle tracks throughout the scheme, and that more could be done to take space from motor vehicles for wider cycle tracks and pavements. Suggested that throughout the scheme, modally filtering some roads and using an area-wide approach to remove cut-through motor traffic could be key to improving the tracks at junctions and freeing up space for wider pavements and tracks.
• Supported the proposals for Chiswick High Road. Considered the design of the side road junctions is a particularly major concern here, and freeing up space for wider cycle tracks and pavements from the road should be possible. Considered Quietway links here also need further work – including a crossing to Prebend Gardens and potentially filtering Duke Road.

• Supported the proposals for Heathfield Terrace / Wellesley Road. Considered the modal filtering proposed here will likely not reduce motor vehicle volumes and speeds enough to enable all-ages, all-abilities cycling, particularly at the eastern end of this section. Considered that the Sutton Lane North roundabout is not appropriate – the consultation indicates that traffic volumes will almost certainly be too high here to have the cyclists in the road mixing with the motor vehicles. Considered links should also be provided to cycle tracks on the A4 from under the bridge.

• Supported the proposals for South Circular Road (Kew Bridge Station). Considered the Kew Bridge junction needs improvement – particularly the bus stop outside Kew Bridge station, and provision on and off the bridge. Considered side roads, particularly Lionel Road South need more work. Considered cyclists should be able to go to and from Capital Interchange Way in all directions.

• Supported the proposals for Kew Bridge Road / Watermans Park / Brentford High Street (East). Considered the side road junctions need more work, and bus lanes do not make appropriate cycling facilities for a wide range of people. Considered the scheme should free up roadspace to create cycle tracks and wider pavements. Considered cycling to and from Green Dragon Lane needs improving, and also the park route is an issue for both all-abilities cycling (gradient) and safety at night.

• Supported the proposals for Brentford High Street (West). Considered the side road junctions need more work to be safe again. Considered the Ealing Road junction will be complex to navigate by bike for some routes. Ealing Road is as a high priority cycling link and needs cycle tracks.

• Supported the extension of CS9 from Brentford High Street to Hounslow town centre. Asked for this done as soon as possible. Also requested that CS9 be extended further west to Heathrow, and east into Kensington & Chelsea to connect to the East-West Cycle Superhighway, using safe and comfortable cycle tracks.

Sustrans

An additional 34 template emails were received from Sustrans. These emails:

• Supported the proposals

• Strongly supported the proposals for Dutch-style segregated cycle tracks with associated traffic signals to keep people cycling safe from traffic on the A315, and measures to reduce rat-running and through-traffic on Wellesley Road.
- Supported proposals for five new signal-controlled pedestrian crossings and the proposed upgrades to pedestrian crossings will also make the route safer and easier for walking. Considered that together they will make the route much safer and more appealing for cycling and walking.

- Suggested that the scheme should extend west to Hounslow and further east into central London, through Kensington and Chelsea.
5. Next steps

We are currently reviewing the detailed feedback and will review the proposals in light of the consultation responses in order to determine the best way forward. All issues raised will be considered and we will continue to discuss the scheme with stakeholders. We will publish a full consultation report, which will include a detailed response to the issues raised and our next steps, later in 2018.
Appendix A: Summary text of consultation proposals

Where would Cycle Superhighway 9 go?

This section of CS9 would provide a continuous, largely-segregated route between Kensington Olympia and Brentford town centre, via Hammersmith and Chiswick.

High volumes of cyclists currently use eastern sections of the proposed CS9 route where there are no protected facilities for them, and many journeys currently made in the area via less active modes could be made by foot or by bike.

Click here for a larger version of the above map (PDF)

The route would connect with Russell Road at the eastern extent, where a Quietway cycle route may be installed in future. It would also connect to a proposed Quietway cycle route off King Street in the vicinity of St Peter’s Garden, providing upgraded walking and cycling connections between Hammersmith and Twickenham along the A316. Consultation on these proposals would take place next year. Click here for more information on Quietways. At the western extent, the current proposals would facilitate safe access for cyclists back into the carriageway before the junction with Dock Road.

An artist’s impression of the proposals along Chiswick High Road, looking east from the junction with Duke’s Avenue
We are working closely with the London Borough of Hounslow to develop proposals to extend CS9 further west through Brentford and towards Hounslow. We expect to hold a public consultation on this section in late 2018.

Click here for detailed proposals for CS9 in Hammersmith and West Kensington

Click here for detailed proposals for CS9 in Chiswick and Brentford town centre

**Why are we proposing this?**

Cycle Superhighway 9 is designed to help us meet the target set out in the Mayor’s draft Transport Strategy of changing the way people choose to travel so that 80 per cent of all London trips are made by foot, bicycle or public transport by 2041, up from 64 per cent today.

Over 3000 trips are already being made daily by people who cycle on some of the streets where improvements are proposed. In addition, areas of this route in Chiswick, Hammersmith and Kensington Olympia have some of the highest concentration of pedestrians in the city. Along the A205 South Circular section of CS9 by Kew Bridge Station, cycling is up nearly six fold and all motor traffic is down by over 20 per cent since 2000. Across London, there are now more than 670,000 cycle trips a day, an increase of over 130 per cent since 2000, making cycling a major mode of transport in the capital.

**Improving safety for people who want to walk and cycle**

CS9 would provide a clearer and safer route for cycling in west London, largely separated from other vehicles. This alignment provides a direct route in the heart of town centres in west London, with good connectivity to other local roads.

Roads on the alignment are currently dominated by motor traffic and can be intimidating and unpleasant places to walk and cycle. Walking and cycling are the healthiest and most sustainable ways to travel, either for whole trips or as part of longer journeys on public transport.

By giving people space and time to cycle through the area more easily, and by providing improved crossing facilities for pedestrians, we can encourage more people to use these healthy and sustainable forms of transport while keeping other traffic moving. These improvements would help to make these streets work better for walking, cycling and public transport, so both individuals and the community as a whole can benefit.

**Facilitating and encouraging active travel in west London**

We want to make it easier for people in west London to use sustainable travel and lead active lifestyles. We also want to make the streets on the CS9 alignment healthier, safer and more welcoming places for everyone. The proposals form part of the Mayor of London’s plan for Healthy Streets a long-term vision to encourage more
Londoners to walk and cycle by making London’s streets healthier, safer and more welcoming.

Currently, only 34 per cent of Londoners take 20 minutes of physical activity on any given day. The new cycle facilities would help to encourage people to use active modes of transport, which could achieve significant health benefits. The proposals aim to encourage people who would like to cycle, but currently feel unable to do so.

A network of Cycle Superhighways exists in north, south and east London, but none in west London. Our proposals would bring a high-quality cycle facility to west London, linking town centres in Hammersmith, Chiswick and Brentford. Data from existing Cycle Superhighways suggest the new route would also draw cyclists away from other routes that are less suitable for them. The introduction of the East-West and North-South Cycle Superhighways in central London has seen significant increases in cycling as a mode of transport.

Connecting and improving town centres

Our proposals would help connect town centres from Kensington Olympia through Hammersmith, Chiswick and Brentford, linking important amenities and facilities in the heart of these town centres, and making them more pleasant places to live, work, shop and spend time.

To make it easier to cross busy roads here, we would install five new pedestrian crossings and upgrade over 20 others. We would also install new seating areas to provide space for people to stop, rest and spend time in these town centres. This would be supported by other improvements to the street environment, including new trees. As well as enabling more Londoners to walk and cycle more often, these proposals would help to create more welcoming and inclusive streets.

When would we build Cycle Superhighway 9?

Subject to the outcome of this consultation, any subsequent follow-up consultations and approvals from partner boroughs, we intend to commence construction on Cycle Superhighway 9 from Kensington Olympia to Brentford town centre in late 2018, and carry out further consultation on the detailed proposals from Brentford to Hounslow in late 2018.

We would plan construction carefully to minimise disruption to those who live, work and travel through the areas. As part of this planning, we would coordinate closely with other construction works in the area, and consider alternative ways of working including advance works, weekends and evenings.

We would also carry out an extensive communications and engagement campaign to ensure residents, businesses and others travelling through the works areas have the information they need to plan ahead and adapt their travel arrangements where
necessary, reducing any impact on their journeys and operations during the construction period.

**How would Cycle Superhighway 9 affect journey times?**

We have carried out detailed traffic modelling on the proposals for Cycle Superhighway 9, to understand how our proposals might affect journey times for general traffic, buses, cyclists and pedestrians.

Despite the sophistication of our traffic models, all traffic modelling is only ever indicative; it is intended to give an idea of where the impacts of changes in journeys are most likely to be felt. It assumes that drivers have perfect knowledge of the network and will always choose the quickest route available.

Traffic modelling has been carried out to study the traffic impacts of the scheme at the busiest times of the day, and results are presented for both the morning and evening peak hours. TfL would actively monitor and manage the road network following implementation to ensure impacts were balanced.

To understand the impacts, we have assessed how London’s roads would operate in 2021, considering population growth, committed developments and other road improvements including the scheme at Hammersmith Gyratory as consulted (details of this scheme are available here). We then test how London’s roads would operate in 2021 with the changes proposed as part of the scheme. This allows us to isolate the predicted impacts of CS9 from other changes which are not part of this consultation.

Click here for information on predicted changes to journey times for general traffic, buses, cyclists, pedestrians and traffic reassignment.

**Tables showing predicted journey time impacts on traffic, buses, cyclists and pedestrian wait times for key journeys (at selected locations) are available for the AM peak and PM peak:**

- click here for a table of AM peak journey time impacts
- click here for a table of PM peak journey time impacts

If you have any questions or clarifications with regards our traffic modelling please email trafficmodelling@tfl.gov.uk for more information.

**Changes to parking and loading**

Our proposals include changes to parking and loading bays and their hours of operation across the proposed route. We will contact premises which we think could be affected during the consultation period. If you think the proposals could affect you or your business, please contact us to let us know. We encourage you to discuss these proposals with your suppliers.
Environmental impacts

Although not a traffic generating scheme, our proposals would change how traffic moves around the area, which may result in some associated and localised changes to air quality and noise levels. Environmental surveys and modelling would take place as part of our ongoing evaluation of these proposals.

Our proposals aim to improve the quality of life in the area by:

• Reducing the dominance of traffic, allowing people to better enjoy the area
• Improving pedestrian crossings and cycle facilities, to encourage people to walk and cycle through the area
• Protecting bus journey times, to encourage people to use public transport

We will be carrying out environmental evaluation and environmental modelling to help our evaluation of the proposals

Air pollution is one of the most significant challenges facing London, affecting the health of all Londoners. As part of the plans for new measures to tackle London’s current poor air quality, we are consulting on proposals to bring forward the introduction of the London Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ).

A number of other schemes to improve London’s air quality are planned including taking steps to reduce air pollution from our bus fleet, reducing emissions from taxis and private hire vehicles, setting up five ‘Low Emission Neighbourhoods’ and expanding the electric vehicle charging network, making it simpler to use. We are investing to make London’s streets healthy, safe and attractive places to walk and cycle. Enabling more journeys to be made on foot or by bike can help reduce private vehicle use and associated emissions. See here for more information on how we are creating Healthy Streets.

Equalities

How TfL fulfils its obligations under the Equality Act 2010

We are subject to the general public sector equality duty set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which requires us to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations by reference to people with protected characteristics. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. As part of our decision-making process on the proposals for Cycle Superhighways, we have had due regard to any impacts on those with protected characteristics and the need to ensure that their interests are taken into account.
In considering the design of our streets, we closely consider the needs of all users throughout the design process. On significant infrastructure projects, such as Cycle Superhighways, we:

- Complete Equality Impact Assessments (EQIAs) at the outset of the project, to review potential impacts on equality target groups, including disabled people

- Carry out public consultations, including targeted engagement with specific users such as (among many others): Royal National Institute of Blind People, Guide Dogs, Age UK, Transport for All, and National Autistic Society

- Ensure we comply with established guidance – such as the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges – which includes detailed requirements for disabled people

The EQIA completed for CS9 shows positive impacts for black and ethnic minority groups, females, disabled cyclists, and cyclists under 25 and over 65 years of age. Positive impacts have also been identified for disabled pedestrians, as the scheme involves a number of improvements to pedestrian facilities including enhanced crossing facilities, increased footway widths and new pedestrian crossings.

Some negative impacts have been identified where footways are cut back or shared use footway is introduced. However the minimum 2 metre standard for footway widths has been maintained to allow two wheelchair users to pass safely, or up to 3 metre footway widths in areas of shared use footway. Kerb-protected cycle facilities, which lead to positive impacts for people with protected characteristics when they are cycling, work most effectively when they feature bus stop bypasses. Bus stop bypasses and their impacts are described below.

**Disabled users**

**How do I cross cycle tracks?**

All crossings of cycle tracks would be on one level, with step-free access from one footway to another and clearly marked out with tactile paving.

**At road junctions with traffic lights**

Some junctions would have a “formal” signalised crossing point across both road and cycle track - marked with contrasting blister tactile paving that extends in a ‘tail’ to the back of the footway. Here:

- cyclists are held at a red light

- pedestrians cross both road and cycle track at the same time as there would typically be no waiting area between road and cycle track

- this crossing would be marked using contrasting blister tactile paving with a tactile tail extending to the back of the footway and dropped kerbs
• audible signals and a pedestrian countdown would be used where feasible, and

• all push button units would have a tactile rotating cone.

**Other junctions would have an “informal” crossing point** – where the road crossing may be signalised but the cycle track is not. Here:

• the signalised road crossing would be marked with red tactile paving and a tactile ‘tail’ extending to the back of the footway

• the cycle track crossing would be marked by contrasting blister tactile paving without a ‘tail’

• there would be a waiting area to between the cycle track and the road at least 2.5m wide and free of intrusive street furniture to ensure space for a wheelchair to turn.

**At signalised (green man) road crossings**

All proposed crossings would be fully signal-controlled - with a green man. All existing zebra crossings of the main road would be converted to signal-controlled crossings. Some junctions would have a signalised crossing point across both road and cycle track - marked using red tactile paving with a tactile ‘tail’ extending to the back of the footway. Here:

• cyclists are held at a red light

• pedestrians cross both road and cycle track at the same time as there would typically be no waiting area between road and cycle track

At other junctions, there would be an “informal” crossing point – where the main road crossing is signalised but the cycle track crossing is not. Here:

• the main road crossing would be marked with red tactile paving and a tactile ‘tail’ extending to the back of the footway

• the cycle track crossing would be marked by yellow tactile paving with no ‘tail’

• there would be a waiting area between the cycle track and the road at least 2.4m wide

**At road crossings that are not signal-controlled**

Most crossings without signals would be removed or converted to signal-controlled. Where an un-signalised crossing remains (e.g. on King Street by Ravenscourt Park), the cycle track crossing point would not be signalised either. It would be marked with contrasting blister tactile paving with no ‘tail’
and a waiting area of at least 2.5m would be provided between road and cycle track.

**How do I get in or out of a car/taxi?**

**In a marked bay next to the cycle track**

Marked parking bays would be provided next to the cycle track. A buffer of at least 0.5 metres between the bay and the track will run flush along the length of the bay. Vehicles with side ramps could deploy them into the cycle track. Same level-access would be provided between the cycle track and footway. Disabled users would be permitted to park in loading bays in:

- London Borough of Hounslow
- London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham
- on the Transport for London Road Network.

**Not in a marked bay next to the cycle track**

Marked bays would be the best places to stop and get in or out of a vehicle in safety and comfort along Cycle Superhighway 9. Space for general traffic would be reduced to a single lane in each direction in some places and all single yellow lines would be replaced with “no waiting or loading at any time” restrictions. Also the kerbed islands between the cycle track and the road, varying in width from 0.5 metres to 2.5 metres, are generally not wide enough for vehicles to deploy ramps onto the island itself.

**How do I get on and off a bus at a stop next to the cycle track?**

“Bus stop bypasses” would be provided. Here, the cycle track continues behind the bus stop at carriageway level, providing continuous segregation from motor traffic for people cycling. Bus passengers access a waiting area by crossing the cycle track using a raised, marked crossing point. The waiting area would be at least 2.5 metres wide. Pedestrians would cross the cycle track at raised, marked crossing points to continue their journey. The footway also continues behind the cycle track.

The bus stop flag would be situated at the left of the crossing point to make the stop easier to find. Kerbs would be high enough (125-140millimetres) to ensure TfL buses can deploy ramps onto the island.

Our research has found that bus stop bypasses are safe for all road users, including bus passengers. Routing cycle traffic away from the road is an effective way to create safe, attractive cycling facilities along bus routes. The risk of conflict between cycles and pedestrians has been found to be very low, while providing a dedicated crossing point for bus passengers and design features that encourage slower cycling help to make the bus stop area more comfortable for everyone to use.
Bus stop bypasses are used across Europe and there are a number of examples in operation or planned across the UK, including in Brighton, Manchester and Cambridge, as well as in London. We introduced some bus stop bypasses on the Cycle Superhighway 2 (CS2) extension between Bow and Stratford in autumn 2013, and across other Cycle Superhighways in 2015-16. We monitor the entire Cycle Superhighway network to ensure it is operating safely and effectively. This includes more than 50 bus stop bypasses across the capital. We are satisfied bus stop bypasses are safe for all road users.

We are continuing to engage with accessibility and cycling groups and carry out additional research into the type and layout of pedestrian crossings at bus stop bypasses. We have a dedicated working group overseeing on-street trialling of the use of zebra crossings over cycle tracks at bus stop bypasses. This group includes representatives from Transport for All, the Royal National Institute of Blind People, Guide Dogs, Age UK London, London TravelWatch, Cycling Embassy of Great Britain, Living Streets, the London Cycling Campaign and Cycling UK. We will incorporate findings of these further investigations, including the outcomes of discussions about the trial with the working group, into final proposals for CS9.

Click here for more information on bus stop bypasses.

At five bus stops on Brentford High Street where space is limited and expected cycle flows are lower, the footway and waiting area would be combined and all pedestrians would cross the cycle track at raised, marked crossing points at each end of the island to continue their journey via the waiting area island. The combined footway and waiting area would be a minimum of 2.5 metres wide, to ensure bus stop accessibility is maintained.

Tactile paving

We would use tactile paving on all crossings and traffic islands along the CS9 route. Tactile paving would be designed according to Department for Transport guidance. We would apply local standards used by our partner boroughs.

Accessibility for cyclists with disabilities

CS9 would be suitable for use by disabled cyclists using adapted bicycles, such as hand cycles and tricycles. The designs adhere as closely as possible to the principles for inclusive cycling set out in our London Cycling Design Standards. Cycle tracks on CS9 would be as wide as possible and a smooth riding surface would be provided, with the entire cycle route to be resurfaced.

How do previous proposals relate to Cycle Superhighway 9?

Previous consultations on measures to improve some of these streets have already taken place.
Hammersmith Gyratory

In January 2017, TfL approved proposals to create dedicated space for cyclists on the northern side of Hammersmith gyratory with the support of Hammersmith & Fulham Council. For more information on the Hammersmith gyratory consultation that took place in spring 2016, please click here.

Our proposals for CS9 would enhance the benefits provided by this scheme by extending the two-way cycle track on King Street to ensure cyclists do not have to mix with general traffic when travelling westbound through the area.

We have listened to residents’ concerns over the reduction in capacity for general traffic on Beadon Road. We have updated our proposal here to ensure traffic can flow more freely through the junction with Hammersmith Grove. We would do this by signalising the junction of Beadon Road and Hammersmith Grove. Currently, vehicles exiting Hammersmith Grove and pedestrians crossing Beadon Road are uncontrolled. This can constrain the amount of traffic on Beadon Road that can flow into Hammersmith Gyratory. Controlling these movements with traffic signals would increase capacity for general traffic on Beadon Road which is the principal route for through traffic here.

This revised design would also allow us to provide a new signal-controlled pedestrian crossing over Beadon Road on the western arm of the junction, which would accommodate growth from surrounding developments. This would also provide enough time for vehicles making local trips to exit Hammersmith Grove and join Beadon Road.

In addition, no new bus lane is proposed on Beadon Road in this design. This means more space for general traffic is retained for approximately 170 metres where bus lane had previously been proposed, but results in longer journeys for people travelling by bus. We will continue to look for ways to minimise or remove increases to bus journey times as much as possible. Click [here] for detailed traffic impacts of the proposals, including a comparison with the consulted scheme at Hammersmith Gyratory.

We remain committed to delivering improvements at Hammersmith Gyratory. Subject to the outcome of this consultation, we would look to deliver these improvements as part of CS9. We intend to start construction of all improvements in Hammersmith Gyratory in late 2018, subject to the outcome of this consultation, any subsequent follow-up consultations and agreeing proposals with partner boroughs.

Wellesley Road (traffic reduction)
In summer 2016, the London Borough of Hounslow carried out a survey on traffic issues with residents and businesses in the Wellesley Road and Stile Hall Gardens area. The responses received indicated high levels of concern at the volume of through traffic – 73per cent responded that there is too much non-residential traffic in the area - and the impact of this on several issues including road safety, attractiveness of the road for walking and cycling and pollution.

In late 2016, LB Hounslow consulted on proposals to reduce through traffic in the area. The majority of respondents (55per cent) were in favour of a closure/no entry to restrict access, and closing access to the South Circular from Wellesley Road and Stile Hall Gardens was the favoured change option (48per cent, or 87per cent of all responses in favour of change).

These measures would reduce traffic on roads through the area, including Wellesley Road, Stile Hall Gardens and Heathfield Terrace. According to surveys carried out in summer 2016, up to 75per cent of vehicles travelling through this residential area is non-residential through traffic. Reducing traffic volumes on these roads would reduce congestion at peak periods, improve access for residents, make it easier for pedestrians to cross these roads and significantly improve conditions for cyclists using them.

**A3320 Warwick Road Safety Scheme**

In 2016, TfL consulted on proposals to improve pedestrian and cycling facilities around the junction of Kensington High Street with Warwick Road and Addison Road. These improvements are unaffected by CS9 proposals, and we intend to implement them early next year.
Appendix B: Consultation questions

Our overall proposals (Q1 mandatory, Q2 optional)

1. Do you support the overall proposals?
2. Do you have any comments on the overall proposals?

Our proposals by section (all optional)

3. Do you support the proposals for Hammersmith Road?
   Do you have any comments on the proposals for Hammersmith Road?
4. Do you support the proposals for Hammersmith Gyratory?
   Do you have any comments on the proposals for Hammersmith Gyratory?
5. Do you support the proposals for Beadon Road?
   Do you have any comments on the proposals for Beadon Road?
6. Do you support the proposals for King Street (East)?
   Do you have any comments on the proposals for King Street (East)?
7. Do you support the proposals for King Street (West)?
   Do you have any comments on the proposals for King Street (West)?
8. Do you support the proposals for Chiswick High Road?
   Do you have any comments on the proposals for Chiswick High Road?
9. Do you support the proposals for Heathfield Terrace / Wellesley Road?
   Do you have any comments on the proposals for Heathfield Terrace / Wellesley Road?
10. Do you support the proposals for South Circular Road (Kew Bridge Station)?
    Do you have any comments on the proposals for South Circular Road (Kew Bridge Station)?
11. Do you support the proposals for Kew Bridge Road / Watermans Park / Brentford High Street (East)?
    Do you have any comments on the proposals for Kew Bridge Road / Watermans Park / Brentford High Street (East)?
12. Do you support the proposals for Brentford High Street (West)?
    Do you have any comments on the proposals for Brentford High Street (West)?
13. Do you have any comments on future proposals for CS9 from Brentford High Street to Hounslow town centre?
About you (all optional)

14 What is your name?
15 What is your email address?
16 Please provide us with your postcode
17 Are you? Please select all that apply
   (Options: Local resident/ Local business owner/ Employed locally/ Visitor to
   the area/ Commuter to the area/ Not local but interested in the scheme/
   Taxi/private hire vehicle driver/ Other)
18 How do you travel through the area? Please select all that apply
   (Options: Private car/Taxi/ Van/ Lorry/ Bus/ Coach/ Cycle/ Walk/wheelchair/
   Tube/ Train/Motorcycle/powered two-wheeler/ Other)
19 If responding on behalf of an organisation, business or campaign group,
   please provide us with a name
20 How did you find out about this consultation?
21 What do you think about the quality of this consultation (for example, the
   information we have provided, any printed material you have received, any
   maps or plans, the website and questionnaire etc.)

   Do you have any further comments about the quality of the consultation
   material?

Equality monitoring (all optional)

22. Gender
23. Ethnic Group
24. Age
25. Sexual Orientation:
26. Faith
27. Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability
   which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months? (Please include
   problems related to old age)
28. If you answered yes to the above questions, please tell us which category
   best describes your disability of health problem.
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Transport for London

Wednesday 20 September 2017

Dear Sir or Madam,

Have your say on Cycle Superhighway 9 in Hammersmith
In close consultation with our partner Hammersmith & Fulham Council, we are proposing to transform roads in Hammersmith and West Kensington as part of proposals for Cycle Superhighway 9 (CS9).

This would change the layout of many roads along the route to make them safer and easier to use, and create a more appealing street environment for everyone to enjoy. CS9 is an important part of the Mayor’s Healthy Streets Approach, which aims to encourage walking, cycling and public transport and make London greener, healthier and more pleasant.

The proposed changes in your area include:
- Two-way segregated cycle track on Hammersmith Road and King Street
- Two new signal-controlled pedestrian crossings and upgrades to existing pedestrian crossings
- Changes to bus stop locations and new bus stop bypasses for cyclists
- Some changes to loading and parking on (or close to) the proposed CS9 alignment
- Public space improvements along the route to create more welcoming and inclusive streets for people and communities to enjoy

The enclosed map shows some of the main changes proposed along Hammersmith Road and King Street. The enclosed artist’s impression shows the view looking east along Hammersmith Road.

Transforming road layouts is not without impacts, and there are difficult choices to be made in determining the layout for roads on the alignment. For example, these changes could mean that some journeys through this area may take longer.

Detailed proposals and additional information, including predicted traffic impacts, can be viewed at: tfl.gov.uk/cs9

MAYOR OF LONDON
Public exhibitions
We will be holding public exhibitions in your area, where you can view the proposals, speak to members of the project team and ask questions. Please check tfl.gov.uk/cs9 on the day of the event for any changes before travelling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grove Neighbourhood Centre</td>
<td>Bradmore Park Road, Hammersmith</td>
<td>Sunday 1 October</td>
<td>1100-1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary's Church Hall</td>
<td>Edith Road, West Kensington</td>
<td>Thursday 5 October</td>
<td>1600-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyric Square</td>
<td>King Street, Hammersmith</td>
<td>Friday 6 October</td>
<td>1100-1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Keys</td>
<td>Black Lion Street, Hammersmith</td>
<td>Wednesday 11 October</td>
<td>1700-2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenscourt Park</td>
<td>Ravenscourt Park</td>
<td>Sunday 22 October</td>
<td>1100-1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have your say on the proposals
The changes we are proposing are one of many options for how roads on the alignment could be laid out. We want to hear what you think, so please visit tfl.gov.uk/cs9 to find out more and to fill in the online survey. The deadline for comments is Tuesday 31 October 2017.

You can also request paper copies of plans and a response form, copies in Braille, large text or another language by emailing consultations@tfl.gov.uk, writing to FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATIONS (CS9), or calling 0343 222 1155.

Have your say on Cycle Superhighway 9 in Chiswick and Brentford
We are also consulting on proposals to build a new cycle route in Chiswick and Brentford as part of CS9. To find out more and have your say, please visit tfl.gov.uk/cs9.

Next steps
We will analyse and consider all responses received, and publish our response in early 2018. Subject to the outcome of this consultation, any subsequent follow-up consultations and agreeing proposals with partner boroughs, we intend to commence construction on Cycle Superhighway 9 in autumn 2018.

Yours faithfully,

Alex Morrison
Consultation Team
Transport for London
Transport for London

Wednesday 20 September 2017

Dear Sir or Madam,

Have your say on Cycle Superhighway 9 from Chiswick to Brentford town centre

In close consultation with our partners the London Borough of Hounslow and Hammersmith & Fulham Council, we are proposing to transform roads in Hammersmith, Chiswick and Brentford town centre as part of Cycle Superhighway 9 (CS9). CS9 is an important part of the Mayor’s Healthy Streets Approach, which aims to encourage walking, cycling and public transport and make London greener, healthier and more pleasant.

Our proposals, largely focused on the A315, aim to make roads safer and easier to use, creating a healthier and more appealing street environment for everyone to enjoy. They would change the layout of many roads along the route. The proposed changes in your area include:

- Two-way segregated cycle track on the south side of Chiswick High Road from Goldhawk Road to Heathfield Terrace
- Three new signal-controlled pedestrian crossings and upgrades to 19 existing pedestrian crossings
- Reducing through traffic and rat-running in residential roads by restricting access to the South Circular from Wellesley Road and Stile Hall Gardens for motor vehicles, making this a more appealing place to walk and cycle
- ‘Stepped’ cycle tracks (at a lower height than the footway) in each direction on Brentford High Street, an eastbound stepped track on Kew Bridge Road, and a westbound cycle path through Waterman’s Park
- Changes to bus stop locations and new bus stop bypasses for cyclists
- Some changes to parking and loading on (or close to) the proposed CS9 alignment

The enclosed map shows some of the main changes proposed along the route in Chiswick and Brentford town centre. The enclosed artist’s impression shows the view looking east along Chiswick High Road. We are also proposing improvements in Hammersmith. To find out more and have your say, please visit tfl.gov.uk/cs9.

MAYOR OF LONDON
Transforming road layouts is not without impacts, and there are difficult choices to be made in determining the layout for roads on the alignment. For example, these changes would mean that some journeys through this area are likely to take longer. Detailed proposals and additional information, including predicted traffic impacts can be viewed at tfl.gov.uk/cs9.

Public exhibitions
We will be holding public exhibitions in your area, where you can view the proposals, speak to members of the project team and ask questions. Please check tfl.gov.uk/cs9 on the day of the event for any changes before travelling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chiswick Town Hall</td>
<td>Heathfield Terrace, Chiswick</td>
<td>Tuesday 26 September</td>
<td>1700-2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Grove House</td>
<td>West Thames College, Isleworth</td>
<td>Thursday 28 September</td>
<td>1700-2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pilot (pub)</td>
<td>Wellesley Road, Chiswick</td>
<td>Monday 2 October</td>
<td>1700-2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiswick High Road</td>
<td>Footway by Windmill Road, Chiswick</td>
<td>Saturday 7 October</td>
<td>1100-1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watermans Art Centre</td>
<td>40 High Street, Brentford</td>
<td>Saturday 14 October</td>
<td>1100-1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentford Market</td>
<td>Market Place, Brentford</td>
<td>Sunday 15 October</td>
<td>1000-1400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have your say on the proposals
The changes we are proposing are one option for how roads on the alignment could be laid out. We want to hear what you think, so please visit tfl.gov.uk/cs9 to find out more and to fill in the online survey. The deadline for comments is Tuesday 31 October 2017.

You can also request paper copies of plans and a response form, copies in Braille, large text or another language by emailing consultations@tfl.gov.uk, writing to FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATIONS (CS9), or calling 0343 222 1155.

Next steps
We will analyse and consider all responses received, and publish our response in early 2018. Subject to the outcome of this consultation, any subsequent follow-up consultations and approvals from partner boroughs, we intend to commence construction on Cycle Superhighway 9 from Kensington Olympia to Brentford town centre in autumn 2018.

Yours faithfully,

Alex Morrison
Consultation Team
Transport for London
Transport for London

Wednesday 20 September 2017

Dear Sir or Madam,

Have your say on Cycle Superhighway 9 from Kensington Olympia to Brentford town centre

In close consultation with our partners, the London Borough of Hounslow and Hammersmith & Fulham Council, we are proposing to transform roads in Hammersmith, Chiswick and Brentford town centre as part of Cycle Superhighway 9 (CS9). CS9 is an important part of the Mayor’s Healthy Streets Approach, which aims to encourage walking, cycling and public transport and make London greener, healthier and more pleasant.

Our proposals, largely focused on the A315, aim to make roads safer and easier to use, creating a more appealing street environment for everyone to enjoy. They would change the layout of many roads along the route.

The enclosed map shows the proposed alignment for CS9 from Kensington Olympia to Hounslow. It also shows some of the main changes proposed from Kensington Olympia to Brentford town centre. The enclosed artist’s impression shows the view looking east along Chiswick High Road.

We intend to extend CS9 west of Brentford towards Hounslow in future, and are working together with the London Borough of Hounslow to develop proposals. We aim to hold a public consultation on this section of the route in late 2018.

Transforming road layouts is not without impacts, and there are difficult choices to be made in determining the layout for roads on the alignment. For example, our proposals would mean that some journeys in the area are likely to take longer.

Detailed proposals and additional information, including predicted traffic impacts can be viewed at TfL.gov.uk/cs9.

MAYOR OF LONDON

VAT number 736 2169 90
Public exhibitions
We will be holding public exhibitions in your area, where you can view the proposals, speak to members of the project team and ask questions. Please check [tfl.gov.uk/cs9](http://tfl.gov.uk/cs9) on the day of the event for any changes before travelling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chiswick Town Hall</td>
<td>Heathfield Terrace, Chiswick</td>
<td>Tuesday 26 September</td>
<td>1700-2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Grove House</td>
<td>West Thames College, Isleworth</td>
<td>Thursday 26 September</td>
<td>1700-2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pilot</td>
<td>Wellesley Road, Chiswick</td>
<td>Monday 2 October</td>
<td>1800-2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiswick High Street</td>
<td>Footway by Windmill Road</td>
<td>Saturday 7 October</td>
<td>1100-1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watermans Art Centre</td>
<td>40 High Street, Brentford</td>
<td>Saturday 14 October</td>
<td>1100-1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentford Market</td>
<td>Market Place, Brentford town centre</td>
<td>Sunday 15 October</td>
<td>1000-1400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have your say on the proposals
The changes we are proposing are one option for how roads on the alignment could be laid out. We want to hear what you think, so please visit [tfl.gov.uk/cs9](http://tfl.gov.uk/cs9) to find out more and to fill in the online survey. The deadline for comments is Tuesday 31 October 2017.

You can also request paper copies of plans and a response form, copies in Braille, large text or another language by emailing consultations@tfl.gov.uk, writing to FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATIONS (CS9), or calling 0343 222 1155.

Next steps
We will analyse and consider all responses received, and publish our response in early 2018. Subject to the outcome of this consultation, any subsequent follow-up consultations, and approvals from partner boroughs, we intend to commence construction on Cycle Superhighway 9 from Kensington Olympia to Brentford town centre in autumn 2018, and carry out further consultation on the detailed proposals from Brentford to Hounslow in late 2018.

Yours faithfully,

Alex Morrison
Consultation Team
Transport for London
Overview Maps accompanying letters

Kensington Olympia to Chiswick

Chiswick to Brentford
Whole route

Cycle Superhighway 9
Kensington Olympia to Hounslow

We are also proposing changes to bus and coach stops, bus lanes, and parking and loading on or close to the CPH pavement through Westway Road / Heathfield Terrace including:

- Bus and coach stop realignment
- Location of new bus and coach stops
- Extension / removal of some bus lanes
- Temporary bus lane, to be removed once
- Some single yellow lines replaced with dashed yellow lines; no parking at any time except in marked bays
- Changes to some parking and loading provisions

Further details of proposed changes, including parking and loading maps are available at hounslow.gov.uk
Maps of distribution areas for consultation letters

West Kensington and Hammersmith

Chiswick and Brentford
Isleworth and Hounslow
Appendix D: Consultation materials

Email to public

An email was sent to over 230,000 people who live or use TfL transport services locally including Oyster and Contactless customers, as well as road users such as Congestion Charge, Cycle Hire and registered Cyclists

---

Dear Test email recipient,

Have your say on Cycle Superhighway 9 in West Kensington, Hammersmith, Chiswick and Brentford.

For full details and to share your views, please visit tfl.gov.uk/cs9

We are seeking your views on proposals to transform roads in West Kensington, Hammersmith, Chiswick and Brentford town centre to make cycling and walking safer and more appealing.

Proposed improvements include dedicated cycle tracks and new pedestrian crossings along the route and removing through traffic on Wellesley Road and Stile Hall Gardens.

This consultation will run until Tuesday 31 October.

Yours sincerely,

Nigel Hardy
Head of Project Sponsorship

These are our customer service updates about consultations. To unsubscribe, please click here

---

Press advertisements

75
Digital advertisements

We also advertised the consultation digitally to mobile devices on 3/4G and WiFi (home and business) within specified postcodes - SW5, W14, W6, W12, W14, W4 and TW8. Users could click through from the advertisement to find out more.

An example of how the advertisement looked on screen can be seen below

Banner advertisement (320 x 50 pixel)
Consultation press release

This press release, issued by the Mayor of London, was first published on london.gov.uk

“GLA - Consultation for new segregated cycle superhighway

21 September 2017

Cycle Superhighway 9 will link Kensington Olympia to Brentford with nearly 6km of segregated track

"This new cycle superhighway will bring a high-quality segregated cycle lane to west London for the very first time."

Sadiq Khan
The Mayor of London

- New cycle superhighway will bring first high-quality segregated lane to west London
- Route will improve cycling and pedestrian facilities

The Mayor of London, Sadiq Khan, has today announced a consultation for a new segregated cycle superhighway that will bring safer cycling to west London.

Cycle Superhighway 9 will add nearly 6km of new segregated track to the capital's roads linking Kensington Olympia to Brentford. It will also feature significant improvements for pedestrians with new traffic light crossings and improvements to pedestrian crossings.

The superhighway forms a key part of the Mayor's work to encourage more Londoners to walk and cycle as he makes the capital's streets healthier, safer and more welcoming.

The Mayor of London, Sadiq Khan, said:

'As the capital continues to grow, it is vital that we encourage more Londoners to walk and cycle to improve health, productivity and air quality. That's why I've set out bold plans to change the way we look at how our transport network and committed record levels of investment to improve cycling. This new cycle superhighway will bring a high-quality segregated cycle lane to west London for the very first time. It will make a real difference in encouraging Londoners of all ages and abilities to get on their bikes and improve conditions for pedestrians across the area.'
Will Norman, London's Walking and Cycling Commissioner, said:

'I'm delighted that we can today announce nearly 6km of new segregated cycle lanes for London. Cycle Superhighway 9 will be hugely important in helping cyclists in the west travel safely and inspire many more Londoners to take up cycling for the first time. It also includes significant improvements for pedestrians that will make walking around the local area more appealing and encourage even more people to add both walking and cycling to their daily routines.'

Cycle Superhighway 9 will see roads transformed from Kensington Olympia to Brentford, making it safer to cycle and easier to cross roads in west London, while reducing through traffic on some residential roads.

The proposal includes nearly 6km of segregated cycle tracks on major west London roads, including Hammersmith Road, King Street, Chiswick High Road, Brentford High Street and Kew Bridge Road, and the ability for cyclists to bypass Hammersmith Gyratory and Kew Bridge Junction. Through traffic will be removed from residential roads Wellesley Road and Stile Hall Gardens, and there will be five new traffic light crossings and more than 20 upgraded pedestrian crossings.

Simon Munk, Infrastructure Campaigner, London Cycling Campaign (LCC), said:

'LCC welcomes the Mayor's plans for a new Cycle Superhighway in West London. This route will tame several dangerous junctions, enable far more people of all ages and abilities to cycle to local shops, stations and into work and extend the Cycle Superhighway network to areas where cycling demand is high but cycling infrastructure is virtually non-existent. It will help achieve the vision of a greener, healthier and less congested city set out in the Mayor's Transport Strategy and is a big step by the Mayor towards fulfilling the commitment made to LCC members and supporters to triple the extent of protected space for cycling on main roads. '

Cllr Wesley Harcourt, Hammersmith & Fulham (H&F) Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Residents' Services, said:

'For many people in H&F, intimidation from the sheer volume of other road users prevents them from cycling, so in our Cycle Strategy we've set out to change that. As part of our aim of becoming the greenest borough in the country, we want to double the number of journeys in the borough being taken by bike. Key to that aim is making people feel safe. This new route enables people to get right across the borough and into central London easily, and without the fear of sharing space with large motor vehicles.'
Cllr Amrit Mann, Deputy Leader of Hounslow Council and Cabinet Member for Environment, said:

'In line with the aspirations of our transport strategy, The London Borough of Hounslow is committed to delivering schemes aimed at encouraging more people to take up cycling and invite all residents and businesses to take the opportunity to shape these proposals.'

Leon Daniels, Managing Director of Surface Transport at TfL, said:

'Giving more people access to safer cycling and easier walking gives huge benefits to London. This is why I’m so pleased we’re able to announce our latest proposal for west London. We want people who live and work in this area to let us know what they think to our plans so we can make them work for as many people as possible.'

Subject to the results of this consultation, Transport for London (TfL) and partner boroughs aim to start building the cycle superhighway late next year.

The intention is to extend Cycle Superhighway 9 into Hounslow and to hold a consultation on this next year.

-ends-
Consultation Postcards

These postcards were distributed at public events, via face to face leafleting outside public events and during the market research exercise with businesses located on the proposed route.

Because of the length of the route we created two versions one for Chiswick and Brentford and the other for Hammersmith.

Chiswick and Brentford Postcard

Side 1

Have your say on Cycle Superhighway 9 in Chiswick and Brentford town centre

Side 2

Have your say on Cycle Superhighway 9 in Chiswick and Brentford town centre

We want your views on proposals to improve facilities for cyclists and public space on Chiswick High Road, Wellesley Road, Kew Bridge Road and Brentford High Street.

We are also proposing improvements in Hammersmith. To find out more about the consultations, get details of our public drop-in sessions and to have your say:

Visit: tfl.gov.uk/cs9
Email: consultations@tfl.gov.uk
Write: FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATIONS
Call: 0343 222 1055

Please submit your views by Tuesday 31 October 2017

*Service and network charges apply.
Visit tfl.gov.uk/terms for details.
Have your say on Cycle Superhighway 9 in Hammersmith

We want your views on proposals to improve facilities for cyclists and pedestrians on Hammersmith Road and King Street.

We are also proposing improvements in Chiswick and Brentford. To find out more about the consultations, get details of our public drop-in sessions and to have your say:

Visit: tfl.gov.uk/cycle9
Email: consultations@tfl.gov.uk
Write: FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATIONS
Call: 0343 222 1555*

Please submit your views by Tuesday 31 October 2017

*Service and network charges apply.
Visit tfl.gov.uk/terms for details.
Overview

In close consultation with our partners the London Borough of Hounslow and the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, we are seeking your views on proposals to transform roads in west Kensington, Hammersmith, Chiswick and Brentford town centre to make cycling and walking easier, safer, and more appealing.

Cycle Superhighway 9 (CS9) would provide improvements for all road users and communities on the alignment, offering a clearer and safer route for people to cycle in west London, making it easier to cross busy roads and removing through traffic on some residential roads. Changing the layout of many of the roads along the CS9 route would create a more appealing environment for everyone to enjoy.

CS9 would form part of an emerging network of Cycle Superhighways. These are an important part of the Mayor’s draft Transport Strategy and Healthy Streets Approach, which aim to encourage walking, cycling and using public transport, and make London greener, healthier and more pleasant.

Transforming road layouts is not without impacts, and there are difficult choices to be made in determining the layout for roads on the alignment. For example, our proposed changes would affect travel times through the area for many people.
Appendix E: Stakeholders

Email sent to stakeholders

Dear Sir or Madam,

In close consultation with our partners the London Borough of Hounslow and the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, we would like your views on proposals to transform roads in west Kensington, Hammersmith, Chiswick and Brentford town centre to make cycling and walking easier, safer and more appealing.

Cycle Superhighway 9 (CS9) would provide improvements for all road users and communities on the alignment, offering a cleaner and safer route for people to cycle in west London, making it easier to cross busy roads and removing through-traffic on some residential roads. Changing the layout of many of the roads along the CS9 route would create a more appealing environment for everyone to enjoy.

CS9 would form part of an emerging network of Cycle Superhighways. These are an important part of the Mayor’s draft Transport Strategy and Healthy Streets Approach, which aim to encourage walking, cycling and using public transport, and make London greener, healthier and more pleasant.

Our proposals include:

- Two-way segregated cycle track on Hammersmith Road, King Street and Chiswick High Road, providing dedicated space for anyone who wants to cycle
- Five new signal-controlled pedestrian crossings and over 20 upgraded pedestrian crossings, making it easier and safer to cross the road
- Reducing through-traffic and rat-running in residential roads by restricting access to the South Circular from West Ealing Road and Stile Hall Gardens for motor vehicles, making these streets more appealing places to walk and cycle
- Slipped cycle tracks (at a lower height than the footway) in each direction on Brentford High Street; eastbound stepped track on Kew Bridge Road; westbound cycle path through Waterman’s Park
- Changes to bus stop locations and layouts, including new bus stop bypasses for cyclists
- Changes to parking and loading bays and hours of operation

For more information and to give us your views, please visit fl.gov.uk/roads/ks5 Please respond before Tuesday 31 October 2017.

We will be holding public events where staff involved in the project will be available to answer your questions. See the website for details of times and locations.

Your faithfully,

Alex Morrison
Consultation Team
Transport for London

Summary of stakeholder responses

This section provides summaries of the 93 responses we received from stakeholders. The full stakeholder responses are always used for analysis purposes. As well as being summarised here, the stakeholder responses are included in the analysis of overall responses covered in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4.

Each summary begins with a statement explaining the stakeholder’s level of support based on their response to a closed question in our online survey asking respondents to state their support for the proposals. Where this closed question had not been answered, we show our analysts’ interpretation of each respondent’s level of support based on their comments. Where the level of support was not clear from the comments, our analysts put ‘no opinion’. Where we have inferred the level of support, this is stated in the summary below.

4.1 Local authorities and statutory bodies

London Borough of Ealing

*Strongly supported the proposals*
The borough supported CS9, and called for similar investment in cycling in Ealing to maximise active travel, reduce pollution and contribute to the Mayor’s vision for London. They had some concerns such as how cycles would access the route from the Southfields and Acton areas of Ealing. They also expressed concern that the cycle track may not be wide enough at these locations: Kew Bridge Rd eastbound, west of Green Dragon Lane; Chiswick High Road East of Netheravon Road (2.7 metre two-way track inside parking bays); Chiswick High Road either side of Chiswick Lane; Chiswick High Road East of Linden Gardens (2.5 metres with no buffer on kerb side); Brentford High Street either side of Pump Alley; and King Street west of Holcombe Street (2.5 metres two-way track past bus stop). The borough also expressed concern about the route ending at the west end of Brentford High Street, with cycles entering high volumes of motor traffic on a narrow road.

London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Supported the proposals (interpreted)

The borough supported the principles of CS9, and stated they would continue to listen to residents’ views on proposals. They provided comments for consideration on specific technical aspects of the proposals:

Section A, Hammersmith Road: the borough called for consistent lane widths between Shortlands and Colet Gardens, pedestrian facilities east/west across Edith Road, alternative facilities for cyclists accessing North End Road and measures to ensure vehicles can turn left into Olympia Way across the cycle track safely. They also called for a review of certain junctions with consideration of servicing requirements for Olympia, and an investigation into alternative locations for the taxi rank proposed on Avonmore Road.

Section B, Hammersmith Gyratory: the borough called for reduced turning movements across the cycle track through a review of access arrangements at Bute Gardens, Wolverton Gardens and Rowan Road.

Section D, King Street (East): the borough called for measures to increase footway space around the bus stop, changes to the pedestrian crossing and confirmation that the cycle track would be fully segregated here.

Section E, King Street (West): the borough called for measures to reduce turning movements across the cycle track at Holcombe Street, Black Lion Lane and Beavor Lane. They called for improved pedestrian facilities, particularly near schools, and for access arrangements at British Grove to remain unchanged. They called for the bus gate on Goldhawk Road to be removed and bus lane hours to remain unchanged. They also called for the mature tree near the West London Free School to be
The borough's officers noted that the Council's full response to the CS9 consultation would be made through a future Cabinet decision, and provided technical comments on design issues and parking alterations.

Section F, Chiswick High Road: the borough called for access into British Grove from Chiswick High Road / King Street to be maintained, measures to maintain footway widths outside Our Lady of Grace and St Edward's Church, measures to allow traffic to emerge from Duke’s Avenue/Duke Road onto Chiswick High Road under signal control and a review of Sunday parking controls within Controlled Parking Zones around Chiswick High Road. They also called for localised changes to parking proposals, including retaining single yellow line on Duke’s Avenue for Church use, not introducing a bay on Duke Road south of Bourne Place where this would block an informal crossing to/from Linden Passage, retaining motorcycle parking on Linden Gardens (east), and adjusting the proposed build-out on Linden Gardens (west) to avoid compromising the loading bay. They called for the planter on Thornton Avenue to be maintained instead of installing a parking bay, and for the proposed night-time taxi rank in the loading bay opposite Brackley Road to operate from midnight – 7am only to retain loading capacity.

Section H, South Circular Road / Kew Bridge Station: the borough called for measures to reduce journey time increases here. They suggested retaining two eastbound general traffic lanes where Kew Bridge Road branches left towards Chiswick Roundabout, and suggested consideration of removing the right turn facility for cyclists here and narrowing lanes on Kew Bridge Road. They also suggested banning the right turn into Lionel Road South from the North Circular (Chiswick High Road) to reduce delays and address concern over pedestrian/vehicle conflict here.

Section I, Kew Bridge Road / Watermans Park / Brentford High Street (East): the borough called for measures to mitigate potential increases in traffic using Green Dragon Lane to avoid increased journey times on Kew Bridge Road.

Section J, Brentford High Street (West): the borough called for the eastbound bus stop at Morrison’s to be retained in its current location, as the bus stop is key to serving Brentford town centre both now and in future.
Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea

Supported the proposals (interpreted)
The borough highlighted elements that benefited people who cycle and bus passengers, such as improved cycle connectivity to Russell Road and the new 24-hour eastbound bus lane. They expressed regret that modelling had so far not isolated the impacts of this new lane for bus journey times, (as opposed to other changes related to the proposals), but were satisfied the scheme would not cause additional traffic congestion based on information available, committing to monitoring impacts carefully should the scheme go ahead. The borough reiterated its opposition to blue surfacing at some CS9 junctions. The borough acknowledged that many people want CS9 to continue east along Kensington High Street, but they said this would be difficult to deliver, not least in terms of traffic capacity at the eastern end. They committed to working with TfL towards an alternative cycling corridor across the borough along Holland Park Avenue/Notting Hill Gate, which, they suggested seemed more viable, albeit still challenging.

4.2 Politicians

Caroline Pidgeon (Joint-chair of the London Assembly Transport Committee)
Supported the proposals
The Assembly Member said she supported this scheme, with some provisos. She expressed concern the scheme does not pass through Kensington & Chelsea to link with the West End. She called for assurance that the recommendations of the trial of zebra crossings at bus stop bypasses are implemented for CS9. She called for further consideration of pedestrian needs in Chiswick High Street, including revisiting the allocation of footway space. She suggested a cycling speed limit might be appropriate at this location.

Chiswick councillors
Gerald McGregor, Robert Oulds, John Todd (Chiswick Homefields)
Sam Hearn, Paul Lynch (Chiswick Riverside)
Samantha Davies, Adrian Lee, Peter Thompson (Turnham Green)
Opposed the proposals
The councillors said they support schemes to make roads streets safer for cycling, particularly those that encourage residents and commuters to cycle more. However, they opposed this cycle route because of its impact on local people. They expressed concern about air pollution; closures to Stile Hall Gardens and Wellesley Road; impacts on businesses and pedestrians from the cycle track, reducing footways and double yellow lines; impact on motor traffic journeys, including buses. They called for more minor interventions to benefit cycling on the A315 that would not affect motor traffic, or for a route along the A4. They objected to CS9 not going to Chiswick Business Park, and called for the scheme to be withdrawn.
Southfield Conservatives (Part of Ealing Central & Acton Conservative Group)

*Strongly opposed the proposals*

The group opposed the scheme, saying there would be negative impacts on pedestrians and trade. They claimed support for the scheme has been increased by non-local campaigns, and that the Department for Transport does not recommend shared-use schemes in this area.

They raised concern that the consultation lacked independent data, and did not explain that responses marked “partial support” would be included in an overall supporter group. They also raised concerns that the consultation did not target enough non-cyclists, that many traders on Chiswick High Road were not targeted in advance, and that many elderly people had not been notified or consulted. They stated the data provided in the consultation materials was inadequate, and criticised the use of a “partial support” option.

Tony Arbour, London Assembly Member

*Opposed the proposals (interpreted)*

The Assembly Member supported segregated cycle tracks in some areas, but raised concerns they were not for Chiswick High Road as they would narrow footways excessively. He expressed concern the consultation would be unduly influenced by non-local people who cycle, and called for the consultation period to be longer. He expressed concern about the impact on motor traffic journeys.

Turnham Green ward councillors

*(Samantha Davies, Adrian Lee, Peter Thompson)*

*Strongly opposed the proposals (interpreted)*

The councillors opposed the scheme on the grounds that it would: adversely affect local businesses; reduce pedestrian access to Chiswick High Road; damage Chiswick's café culture; disrupt activities at the local Catholic Church; increase local crime (cycles used for snatch thefts and for planned heists from high-value retailers such as jewellers); congestion in Chiswick town centre; encourage fast cycling; banned turns for motor traffic at some junctions; and changes to bus stops. The councillors supported an alternative route along the A4.

4.3 Emergency services

Metropolitan Police Service

*Neither support nor oppose (interpreted)*

The police provided a number of comments and questions about details of the route. They expressed concern about skid resistance of any coloured surfacing. They asked about the consistency of Give Way markings at junctions. They expressed concern about left hook risks at the junction with Kew Bridge Road and on Kew
Road. They asked whether there would be separate cycle traffic light phases at the junction of Chiswick High Road and Wellesley Road. They opposed the mini-roundabout at Sutton Lane North, which they said would be unsuitable for less-experienced people cycling. They asked why there is an internal stop line in Chiswick High Road on the east side of the junction with Heathfield Terrace. They asked that the dropped kerbs in Annandale Road be removed to discourage informal crossing in ahead of stationary traffic. They questioned sightlines for drivers exiting Beavor Lane and Vencourt Place. They asked for details of operation of the shared space on the north footway to the west of Studland Street. They raised concerns that the use of ‘elephants feet’ at the parallel crossing over King Street may not be in line with regulations. They requested confirmation that vehicles would be able to overtake buses at bus stops on King Street, and raised concerns that the left-turn arrow on the cycle track between Beadon Road and Shepherd’s Bus Road may be misinterpreted to mean cyclists should join the road to their left. They requested clarity on measures proposed to discourage drivers exiting Shepherd’s Bush Road from blocking the cycle track in heavy traffic.

4.4 Accessibility groups

Middlesex Association for the Blind

*Strongly supported the proposals (interpreted)*

The association supported the proposals, saying CS9 would provide more opportunities for its service users to cycle using two-seater tricycles. They said safer roads for cycling help visually impaired people to enjoy cycling as a leisure activity, allowing riders to cycle at different venues rather than being limited to a single venue. They said protected cycle lanes would make London a more attractive city in which to run their services.

National Federation for the Blind / Pocklington Lodge

*Opposed the proposals (interpreted)*

The responses expressed concern about the operation of bus stop bypasses for people with visually impairments. They welcomed the use of tactile paving, but still raised concerns about the potential dangers when boarding or alighting from a bus.

Wheels for Wellbeing

*Strongly supported the proposals*

The organisation supported the proposals and said it was pleased disabled cycling is mentioned in Cycle Superhighways consultation materials. They called for CS9 to
link to Hyde Park. While welcoming the high-quality route, they expressed concern a two-way track could reduce the route’s amenity for local cycling journeys. They called for cycle parking to adequately allow for the fact that some disabled cyclists are not able to walk long distances. They suggested the consultation materials include further details of nearby existing and proposed cycle routes, and a clearer plan of the proposed bus gate on Goldhawk Road.

Section A, Hammersmith Road: the organisation queried the operation of right turn pockets for cyclists at Russell Road / Radnor Terrace, and called for a safe facility for cyclists here. They also called for the cycle track to continue over the bridge, and for Olympia Way to be made two-way to improve access from the station. They requested a protected entry into the cycle track on North End Road.

Section D, King Street (east): the organisation raised concerns over cycle parking here, and called for sufficient cycle parking close to amenities and the cycle track here. They also called for cycle access into Kings Mall and cycle parking within the Mall.

Section E, King Street (west): the organisation raised concern over proposed staggered pedestrian crossings of the cycle track, calling for a straight across crossing for pedestrians with dropped kerbs for cyclists. They raised concern over shared crossings, and called for mini-zebra crossings over the cycle track level with the crossing of the carriageway instead. The organisation supported the loading bay bypass between Argyle Place and Dimes Place, and called for contra-flow cycling to be permitted on Dalling Road to benefit local residents using CS9.

Section F, Chiswick High Road: the organisation raised concerns that the bus gate on Goldhawk Road may not be friendly to cyclists, and called for a straight through cycle facility here. They also called for reliable level access at shared use crossings and measures to make connections clearer for all users (e.g. mini-zebra crossings) at Chiswick Lane. They raised concerns that turning radii for cyclists seem tight at the two-stage right turn pocket at Annandale Road, and at the turn from Heathfield Terrace onto Chiswick High Road. They called for improvements to cycle facilities on Chiswick High Road west of Heathfield Terrace, to connect with key stations, employers and local businesses.

Section G, Wellesley Road: the organisation called for a more significant intervention at the junction of Heathfield Terrace / Wellesley Road, suggesting road closures or re-alignment. They called for measures to reduce and calm traffic on this route, such as a well-backed up 20mph design and sinusoidal humps.

Section H, South Circular Road / Kew Bridge Station: the organisation called for access for cyclists on Wellesley Road into Capital Interchange Way to link with the leisure centre, school and forthcoming Brentford Community Stadium. They raised
concerns that speeds of traffic turning into Lionel Road South make this area unsafe, and suggested reversing the direction of the one-way system on Lionel Road South and implementing measures to clarify cycle priority. They raised concern that there is no physically segregated facility for cyclists at the eastbound bus stop by Kew Bridge Station, and called for a bus stop bypass here. They called for smooth surfaces with no sharp shifts in gradient or camber in steeper areas.

Section I, Kew Bridge Road / Watermans Park / Brentford High Street (East): the organisation raised concerns that only a bus lane is provided for cyclists east of the park, and called for continuous segregation at loading bays and bus stops here. They suggested a higher cost intervention at Watermans Park, to minimise the impact on green space, and called for careful inclusive design to permit cycling for all in both directions through the park.

Section J, Brentford High Street (West): the organisation called for improved access into side roads from the cycle track, and suggested a zebra crossing and relocated bus stop to facilitate access into Alexandra Road.

4.5 Transport and road user groups

Alliance of British Drivers

Opposed the proposals
The organisation expressed concern about increased congestion and questioned the validity of expenditure on a scheme that provides most benefits to cycling. They also raised concerns that the consultation materials did not provide cost/benefit data.

Brent Cyclists

Supported the proposals
The group said the scheme was good overall, but expressed concerns about some elements. They called for a link to Hyde Park, changes to the junction at Blythe Road and Brook Green; improved protection for cycling south of the Hammersmith one-way system; improved cycle access to Studland Street; road narrowing instead of footway reduction; a bus stop bypass near Kew Bridge Station and cycle connection to Capital Interchange Way; and an extension from Brentford to Hounslow town centre. They group also objected to sections where cycles have to share road space with motor traffic.

Brewery Logistics Group

Opposed the proposals (interpreted)
The group supported improved safety for vulnerable road users and the need to reduce carbon emissions in London. However, they opposed the scheme and commented on increased motor traffic journey times, and expressed concern about 3-metre road widths having an adverse effect on HGVs. They also said changes to parking and loading would affect deliveries. They called for better contact between businesses and suppliers when major road changes are implemented. They said that Fuller Smith and Turner, based in Chiswick, would be engaged further with the CS9 project.

Cycling Embassy of GB

*Strongly supported the proposals*

The organisation supported the proposals, saying the route is of a high quality. They said it should link to CS3 in Hyde Park and the Quietway along Exhibition Road. They called for the route’s effective width to be maximised through the use of low, angled kerbing between track and footway, and for the cycle track to be higher than the carriageway to give a clearer indication of priority at side roads, slowing turning traffic. They called for centre-line markings continuously along all two-way sections of cycle track to improve clarity for cycle traffic and other users, and said cycle symbols and arrows could also be used to improve recognition of the two-way facility.

They called for the cycle track to be designed to allow motor traffic crossing it to deal with the track and the main carriageway in two separate stages. Alternatively, they called for more side roads to be filtered to reduce or remove turning conflicts. They supported area-wide filtering from minor roads. They called for more continuous footways at minor side roads and for pedestrian crossings to be single-stage. They called for zebra crossings at bus stop bypasses, and in preference to signalised crossings of the cycle track.

Section A, Hammersmith Road: The organisation called for a cycle separated junction at Holland Road.

Section B, Hammersmith Gyratory: The organisation called for signal timings to ensure people can cycle across the gyratory with minimal stops, and for measures to make it clear that the cycle tracks do not continue south. They also called for the narrower road widths and a raised cycle track at the Black’s Road junction.

Section C, Beadon Road: The organisation called for measures to separate people who want to cycle from motor traffic here with pedestrian priority at crossings, and for a contraflow protected cycle track on Beadon Road.
Section D, King Street (east): The organisation called for the carriageway to be narrowed here to increase the footway and/or cycle track.

Section E, King Street (west): The organisation called for the carriageway to be narrowed here to increase the footway and/or cycle track, and for the island separating the cycle track from the main carriageway to be widened. They also suggested measures to reduce interaction between cyclists and motor vehicles at side roads, suggesting that Hamlet Gardens/ Westcroft Square could be converted to entry/exit only.

Section F, Chiswick High Road: The organisation called for the carriageway to be narrowed here to increase the footway and/or cycle track, and for the island separating the cycle track from the main carriageway to be widened. They also suggested measures to reduce interaction between cyclists and motor vehicles at side roads, suggesting that Duke’s Avenue be closed to motor traffic at the junction with Chiswick High Road and that zebra crossings be used at this junction. They noted plans did not make it clear whether access would still be permitted between Chiswick High Road and Devonshire Road.

Section G, Wellesley Road / Heathfield Terrace: The organisation called for measures to reduce motor traffic levels to around 2000 motor vehicles per day, and suggested physical separation to Sutton Court Road if this remains a through route for motor traffic. They called for the mini roundabout to be replaced with a give way junction. They requested a self-enforcing 20mph limit throughout this area, and continuous footways at all side roads here.

Section H, South Circular / Kew Bridge Station: The organisation called for access between Capital Interchange Way and Wellesley Road for people who want to cycle. They suggested a continuous footway and raised cycle way across Lionel Road South, and that this route be closed to motor traffic travelling through the area and made two-way for cyclists. They called for access into Lionel Road South from the south side of Chiswick High Road. They requested a bus stop bypass with zebra crossing at Kew Bridge Station, and requested segregated cycle facilities at the junction of Kew Road (though acknowledged this may be beyond the scope of this scheme).

Section I, Kew Bridge Road / Watermans Park: The organisation called for a continuous protected cycle lane from Pump House Crescent to Kew Bridge junction, raising concerns with cycling in bus lanes. They suggested measures to limit through traffic on Green Dragon Lane.

Section J, Brentford High Street: The organisation called for continuous protection for people who want to cycle here, particularly at the Ealing Road junction. They also requested measures to limit turning movements at side roads be considered.
Freight Transport Association

**Opposed the proposals**
The association said they supported the scheme in principle, but expressed concern about the impact on freight. They expressed concern about a reduction in carriageway for general traffic would lead to increased journey times and pollution, in particular near the South Circular Road and Kew Bridge. They said congestion here could affect journeys to Heathrow Airport and the M4. They expressed concern about 3-metre wide lanes being too narrow for HGVs. They called for loading bays to have a waiting time of 40 minutes, instead of 20 minutes, to account for additional time to load across cycle lanes. The organisation called for loading bays to be at footway level to make loading easier and safer, for more loading bays and for pub bays to be located near cellar doors, and for rumble strips on cycle tracks to notify cyclist of loading bays. The association objected to sharing loading bays with disabled drivers because these vehicles can legally occupy bays for several hours, disrupting deliveries. They commented that deliveries are to residential addresses, and these need to be catered for too. They called for better communication with the industry about roadworks, and called for better traffic management to manage congestion during works.

Hammersmith & Fulham Cycling Campaign

**Strongly supported the proposals**
The group supported the scheme, saying it would improve safety for people who walk and cycle. They expressed concern that a lack of turning opportunities at Edith Road and North End Road would mean some cyclists would remain in the carriageway. They requested the cycle track coming from Black’s Road be abandoned to allow better progression for cyclists travelling east from King Street to Hammersmith Road. They called for improved provision for southbound cyclists on Shepherd’s Bush Road to join the cycle track, stating the proposed route via Brook Green and Wolverton Gardens is unreasonable.

They expressed concern about the configuration of two pedestrian crossings at Beadon Road, calling for adjustments to ensure they operate smoothly. They called for provision for southbound cycles on Shepherds Bush Road to enter CS9. They supported a bus lane on Beadon Road. They called for the use of with-flow cycle tracks in King Street, and noted that coloured surfacing could be incompatible with the conservation area. They expressed concern that people cycling on two-way tracks could be vulnerable to drivers not paying adequate attention. They expressed
concern that consultation materials omitted key information on the operation of the proposed cycle track and other bus journey times.

Hounslow Cycling Campaign

*Strongly supported the proposals*

The group supported the scheme, saying it would provide benefits for children, parents and shoppers who cycle, as well as older people and those with reduced mobility who use cycles to help getting around. They called for CS9 to extend to Hyde Park, and for plans to exist to upgrade the route to with-flow tracks should there be demand. They also fully supported the proposed extension to Hounslow Town Centre. They said they expected the route to encourage non-motorised transport and help improve health and reduce pollution.

Section F, Chiswick High Road: the group suggested that it may be better to take space from the road rather than the footway outside the Catholic Church, and that with-flow cycle tracks may be better than the proposed two-way cycle track here.

Section G, Wellesley Road / Heathfield Terrace: they called for CS9 to avoid traffic queuing at Sutton Court Road by continuing on Chiswick High Road and taking a parallel route across Turnham Green to avoid the junction of Heathfield Terrace and Sutton Court Road. The group fully supported the closure of Wellesley Road, and requested a 20mph limit for all traffic, a single traffic lane and with flow cycle lanes here. They called for the removal of the central island at pedestrian crossings at Sutton North Lane to remove a perceived pinch point, or for a protected segregated cycle path here.

Section H, South Circular / Kew Bridge Station: they called for a with flow protected cycle lane for eastbound cyclists in front of Kew Bridge Station. They also called for the traffic flow on Lionel Road South to be reversed to avoid a left hook risk for cyclists, banning the right turn into Lionel Road South from the South Circular, and a 20mph limit on Lionel Road South. They opposed the widening of the entrance to Lionel Road South. They called for the stepped cycle track to be wider than 1.5m, and improved enforcement of parking restrictions at the junction with Kew Bridge Court. They requested further investigation into the operation of the junction of Kew Bridge Road and the South Circular, and suggested the cycle track be amended to accommodate cyclists exiting Strand-on-the-Green to access Stile Hall Gardens or Wellesley Road. They requested shared use footpaths over Kew Bridge and cycle priority at Strand-on-the-Green be reviewed to link CS9 into the wider network.

Section I, Kew Bridge Road / Watermans Park: the group called for connections be provided between CS9 and Green Dragon Lane. They also called for a protected, level westbound cycle lane above Watermans Park, and suggested options for a
new cantilevered structure to support this. They raised concern that a cycle track through Waterman’s Park would be less readily monitored than a level route.

Licensed Taxi Drivers Association

*Opposed the proposals* (interpreted)

The association objected to the removal of a taxi rank in Hammersmith Road that serves Olympia. They said relocating the rank to Avonmore Road would mean it was not visible to people leaving Olympia. The rank would be served by fewer taxis because taxi drivers would not divert to Avonmore Road. They said the new location would disadvantage passengers with mobility issues, being farther away and the other side of a main road. They noted that Avonmore Road is a residential road and taxis would increase traffic noise and congestion caused by U-turns.

Living Streets

*Strongly supported the proposals*

The organisation supported the scheme due to its positive impact on walking and cycling. They called for the scheme to remove carriageway space, not footways – in line with the Mayor’s draft Transport Strategy – expressing concern that this could compromise the amenity and safety of pedestrians, particularly the more vulnerable. They called for footways to be ‘decluttered’, and opposed shared footway elements. They expressed concern about replacing zebra crossings with signalised crossings, and called for wait times to be minimised. They supported 20mph and called for this to be extended on Kensington High Street. They supported retention and prioritisation of bus movements and improved journey times.

They supported the narrowing of junctions with main roads and suggested all minor side roads should be continuous footways. They supported extended bus lane hours, and called for measures to give pedestrians priority and encourage cyclists to slow down at bus stop bypasses. They raised concerns that Hammersmith Gyratory would be retained, stating it is a hostile environment at odds with the Healthy Streets agenda. They supported signalised crossings and footway widening at Hammersmith Grove.

They raised concerns over reduction in footway on King Street near Lyric Square and the Hammersmith & Fulham Council offices, and called for measures to ensure pedestrian comfort levels remain high and footways are free from clutter. They also raised concern about reduction in footway on busy areas of Chiswick High Road, and called for footway widening between Duke Road and Duke’s Avenue, and at the junction with Goldhawk Road / British Grove.
They opposed shared footways at the crossing between Studland Street and Dalling Road and Chiswick Lane, calling for cyclist access to these streets to avoid using pedestrian crossings. They supported the removal of the mini-roundabout at Brooks Road and new entry treatments. They opposed proposals on the South Circular / Kew Bridge, stating this would remain a car dominated environment with pedestrians crossing in several stages. They also opposed the proposed loss of footway behind some bus stop bypasses on Kew Bridge Road.

They called for consultation materials to include footway comfort levels, pedestrian crossing times and adjacent land uses.

London Living Streets

*Strongly supported the proposals*
The organisation agreed with the issues raised by the national Living Streets group.

London Cycling Campaign

*Supported the proposals (interpreted)*
The organisation supported CS9, saying it would improve enable many more people to enjoy cycling in the area. They called for improved connections at both ends of the route, through Kensington & Chelsea, to Hounslow town centre, and to Hounslow town centre. They called for more carriageway space to be used for CS9, rather than footway. They said junctions should provide safe and convenient cycling in all directions. They called for all schemes to meet LCDS standards and to have a CLOS rating of 70 or above with all ‘critical fails’ eliminated

Section A, Hammersmith Road: The organisation called for filtering of Rowan Road, Luxembourg Gardens and Colet Gardens; improved crossings at Shortlands and Blythe Road; road narrowing to accommodate a wider cycle track and/or footways; and an improved link from CS9 to North End Road.

Section B, Hammersmith Road: The organisation called for filtering of Bute Gardens and Wolverton Gardens; removal of the speed hump near Bute Gardens; improved connectivity to Shepherd’s Bush Road; pedestrian-cycle-friendly traffic light phases in King Street; and safety Improvements to the Black’s Road crossing

Section C, Beadon Road: The organisation called for a protected cycle track to run behind the current bus stop; and for cycle tracks on Beadon Road.

Section E, King Street West: Called for filtering of Cambridge Grove, Leamore Street, Rivercourt Road and Weltje Road; safety improvements to side roads such
as Holcombe Street; removal of flare lanes and parking along King Street to accommodate wider cycle track and footways, with loading moved to side streets; reduction of motor traffic at Nigel Playfair Avenue (including vehicles using H&F Council offices); continuous footways at side roads; removal of trees in centre of cycle track; and a simplified junction at British Grove.

Section F, Chiswick High Road: The organisation called for improved cycling access to Prebend Gardens and Turnham Green Station; a modal filter cell around Netherarvon Road, Airedale Avenue and Homefield Road; filtering of Cranbrook Road; improved safety at the junctions with Brackley Road, Anandale Road, Devonshire Road, Duke Road and Duke’s Avenue (with filtering considered); and safety improvements to the Heathfield Terrace junction, increasing footway space if possible.

Section G, Wellesley Road, Heathfield Terrace: The organisation called for filtering to reduce motor traffic in roads in this section, including Walpole Gardens, Sutton Lane North, Wellesley Road, Heathfield Terrace, with a view to reducing traffic volumes to below 2,000 PCUs daily; road design to limit speeds to 20mph or below; consistent side road treatments; removal of pinch points for cycling; and better access to cycling facilities by the A4.

Section H, South Circular Road (Kew Bridge Station): The organisation called for the link to and from Capital Interchange Way to be two-way for cycling; Stile Hall Gardens and Lionel Road South to be filtered; safe cycling facilities outside Kew Bridge station and across Kew Bridge itself; and the removal of the left hook risk at Strand-on-the-Green.

Section I, Brentford High Street (East), Watermans Park, Kew Bridge Road: The organisation called for improved cycling access to Green Dragon Lane; cycle tracks not wide bus lanes; side roads and junctions designed better to enforce calm driving; and alternatives to Watermans Park, which has issues with gradient safety after dark.

Section J, Brentford High Street (West): The organisation called for safety at side roads to be improved and area-wide filtering; cycle tracks in Ealing Road, removing any shared space; and extension of CS9 to Half Acre to link with the scheme being developed there.

London TravelWatch

Supported the proposals (interpreted)
The organisation welcomed the major expansion of cycling in new parts of London. They supported new bus lanes and extended hours of operation, saying changes
would benefit bus passengers and cyclists, and called for additional operational hours. They expressed concern about the impact on pedestrians of reducing footways at some locations, and at the use of bus stop bypasses, suggesting wide inside lanes adjacent to bus stops instead. They expressed concern about changes to lanes affecting bus journey times and reliability. They expressed concern about two-way cycle tracks, saying they could confuse pedestrians and drivers. The organisation called for ASLs to be provided at signalised junctions.

Road Haulage Association

Opposed the proposals
The organisation expressed concern about the reduction in carriageway for general traffic, saying it would lead to increased journey times and pollution, in particular near the South Circular Road and Kew Bridge. They said network resilience would be seriously reduced, cutting London in half north and south of the River Thames in the event of roadworks or breakdowns. They expressed concern about delays from Ealing Road to Kew Bridge and from Chiswick Roundabout to Goldhawk Road. They expressed concern about 3-metre wide lanes being too narrow for HGVs. They called for loading bays to have a waiting time of 40 minutes, instead of 20 minutes, to account for additional time to load across cycle lanes. The organisation called for loading bays to be at footway level to make loading easier and safer, for more loading bays and for pub bays to be located near cellar doors, and for rumble strips on cycle tracks to notify cyclist of loading bays. The organisation objected to sharing loading bays with disabled drivers because these vehicles can legally occupy bays for several hours, disrupting deliveries. They commented that deliveries take place to residential addresses, and these need to be catered for too.

Stop Killing Cyclists

Strongly supported the proposals
The group strongly supported the proposals, saying it would provide benefits to pedestrians and cyclists. They supported plans for priority for pedestrians and cycling at side roads. They also called for all junctions to include safe physically protected left-hand turns and safe right turns.

Sustrans

Strongly supported the proposals
The organisation said the scheme was good overall, and would benefit health, air quality and the environment by encouraging sustainable travel. They expressed support for segregated tracks, bus stop bypasses, closing roads to through motor
traffic, cycle/pedestrian priority across side roads, and urban realm improvements. They expressed concern about two-way tracks, narrow sections of track, and the retention of the mini-roundabout at Heathfield Terrace and Wellesley Road.

Section A: They supported pedestrian and cycle priority at side roads, tightened corners, improved urban realm and pedestrian improvements at Shortlands. Expressed concern about the junction with Holland Road, while supporting cycle and pedestrian priority and raised tables at side-roads.

Section B: They supported the transformation of the one-way system to improve cycle and pedestrian safety.

Section C: They supported the three pedestrian crossings, and called for a bus stop bypass behind Hammersmith Underground station.

Section D: They called for all motorised traffic to be removed from this major retail street, with possible exception of buses.

Section E: They called for improvements to side road safety, along with other detailed comments on junctions and crossings. They supported improved connectivity from CS9 to side-roads, urban realm improvements, and called for more cycle parking.

Section F: They expressed concern about cycle connectivity to side roads, and the lack of cycle-specific signals at Chiswick. They supported the new bus lane operating hours and bus gate on Goldhawk Road. They called for wider footways and reductions in carriageway space.

Section G: They supported the removal of the mini-roundabout at Brooks Road, and called for 20mph where motorists and cycles share the carriageway. They called for improved safety at side roads, and removal of the mini-roundabout at Heathfield Terrace.

Section H: They supported the closure of Wellesley Road to all traffic except cycles, and the closure of Stile Hall Gardens. They highlighted concerns at major junctions, where turning traffic could present a risk to cyclists using CS9. They objected to cycles sharing the bus lane. They supported bus stop bypasses on Kew Bridge Road and safer side road treatments.

Section J: They supported the segregation and continuity of CS9, side-road treatments that prioritise both pedestrian and cyclists, and bus stop and loading bay bypasses.
Vision Zero London

*Strongly supported the proposals*
They supported the scheme, but called for more continuous footways at side roads.

### 4.6 Business groups

**Hammersmith London BID**

*Supported the proposals*

The organisation for businesses around Hammersmith Gyratory and King Street supported CS9, but called for more education for pedestrians and measures to stop a perceived rise in aggressive cycling. They called for pedestrians to use crossings more, and expressed concern about faster cycling causing more collisions. They called for an additional pedestrian crossing outside the east entrance of Kings Mall. Furthermore, they said this can be made safer by landscape and architectural design. They expressed concern about consolidation of loading bays causing problems for some businesses, and proposed CS9 include a sustainable delivery strategy. They supported safety improvements to the Hammersmith one-way system, as well as calling for enhanced counter-terrorism measures to protect the station.

**West London Business**

*Supported the proposals*

The organisation for businesses in west London supported CS9 as a means of encouraging modal shift to cycling and other low impact means of transport. They called for an on-carriageway westbound cycle facility instead of using Watermans Park, and for improved pavement designs in Chiswick to minimise impact on local businesses and places of worship.

### 4.7 Businesses, employers and venues

**Active360 (Bedford Close, W4 2UE)**

*Strongly supported the proposals*

The business said the scheme would be good for Chiswick. They stated it would help improve congestion, safety and air pollution in an area that is currently not cycle-friendly and congested.

**Arrow Electrical (Chiswick High Road, W4 2ND)**

*Strongly opposed the proposals*

The business said the scheme would increase congestion, as well as making it difficult to park near local shops.
ASD Properties

*Strongly opposed the proposals (interpreted)*

The business called for a cycle route along the A4 instead. They expressed concern about pedestrian safety, particularly where people cycling did not obey traffic signals. They suggested people visiting restaurants, bars and other businesses with outside dining would be at increased risk of drive-by theft due to the closer proximity of street access and easier escape routes for would-be criminals. They suggested CS9 would be a blight on their urban landscape, particularly the loss of several mature trees in Chiswick High Street. They claimed all business along CS9 would lose business as customers would not want to frequent any establishment with a busy cycle route nearby. They said the impact on parking and loading would be detrimental to businesses, as would the impact of congestion. They objected to the relocation of some bus facilities could block junctions due to buses stacking at stops.

Barbed (King Street, W6 9NJ)

*Strongly opposed the proposals*

The furniture business expressed concern about the scheme’s impact on parking and loading for owners and customers, and about poor standards of cyclist behaviour. They stated it would have a detrimental impact on businesses on the proposed route, and would worsen safety for pedestrians and cyclists. They raised concern that the consultation materials were complicated, jargon-heavy and not sufficiently descriptive. They also raised concern that the consultation would be a box-ticking exercise, and that opposition would be ignored as the proposal was a foregone conclusion.

Bathrooms etc (Hammersmith Road, W6 9JP)

*Strongly opposed the proposals*

The business expressed concern the scheme would increase traffic and pollution in the Hammersmith Road area, and claimed existing cycling facilities are adequate. They said the proposals would affect delivery of bulky items and reduce the ability of customers to visit their premises. They opposed changes to bus stops and new road layouts. They expressed concern that consultation material was sent late, and not by mail.

Bedford Park Estates (Sandbanks Road, BH14 8HY)

*Strongly opposed the proposals (interpreted)*

The business which own retail units on Chiswick High Road opposed CS9 due to their perception that the scheme would leave as little as 30cm of footway in some locations near its retail outlets. They expressed concern about congestion on Bourne Place, and danger to pedestrians and bus passengers, saying that Cycle Superhighways elsewhere in London had caused pedestrian fatalities to increase significantly due to collisions with cycles. They expressed concern that cycles would not be able to overtake in the new track. They said the scheme threatened the café culture and Chiswick community.
**Bookcase Chiswick (Chiswick High Road, W4 1PD)**  
*Neither supported nor opposed the proposals*  
The bookseller asked about the scheme’s impact on parking and loading, seeking assurances they would still be able to receive deliveries via their front entrance.

**C Brewer & Sons (Hammersmith Road, W6 7JP)**  
*Opposed the proposals*  
The business said the scheme would make loading more difficult, affecting their business.

**Clarke Associates (Seymour Road, W4 5ES)**  
*Strongly supported the proposals*  
The architecture firm supported the scheme and called for implementation as soon as possible.

**Cyclehoop (Burnham Way, SE26 5AG)**  
*Strongly supported the proposals*  
The cycle parking business said the scheme would improve London's environment.

**Cycledelik (Jeddo Road, W12 9EE)**  
*Strongly supported the proposals*  
The bike mechanic business supported the scheme, but called for attention to be paid to utility and service vehicles. They suggested more could be done to raise awareness of the consultation, through targeted postal campaigns or leaflet handouts at supermarkets.

**DHL (Horton Road, SL3 OBB)**  
*Opposed the proposals (interpreted)*  
The business supported the response of the Freight Transport Association (see above).

**Dogtown (Chiswick High Road, W4 2EF)**  
*Strongly opposed the proposals*  
The pet care business said the scheme would negatively affect Chiswick High Road and local businesses. They claimed that changes to parking and loading would reduce trade, and called for changes to manage the impact including a dedicated drop off and collection zone. They said the cycle track would divide Chiswick High Road in two parts, and also called for the consultation to be extended.

**Douglas Rackley & Partners (The Avenue, W4 1HR)**  
*Strongly opposed the proposals*  
The surveyors business said the scheme would endanger pedestrians and disconnect the two sides of Chiswick High Road, and raised health and safety
concerns over proposals for Hammersmith Gyratory. They suggested a riverside cycle route or one along the A4.

**Devstars (Church Street, TW18 4EP)**  
*Strongly supported the proposals*  
The web design and development agency supported CS9 and called for more cycle lanes with priority over side roads.

**Eco Cycle (SW11 1QB)**  
*Strongly supported the proposals*  
The cycle storage business supported CS9, although expressed a preference for with-flow cycle tracks. They called for more secure cycle parking, and suggested construction to start at the earliest opportunity.

**Foster Books (Chiswick High Road, W4 2DR)**  
*Strongly opposed the proposals*  
The business opposed CS9, expressing concern about increased congestion on main roads and surrounding minor roads. The business claimed not to have been notified about the consultation. They expressed concern about a loss of parking near shops and reduced loading options. They also opposed any loss of mature trees, called for CS9 to route along the A4 instead, and expressed concern about the scheme affecting police traffic movements. They also expressed concern that they and other businesses did not receive any consultation materials and found out about the plans on Twitter.

**Glaxo-SmithKline (GSK) (Great West Road, TW8 9GS)**  
*Strongly supported the proposals*  
The business supported the scheme and called for it to be extended to Hyde Park and Heathrow Airport. They welcomed a safe cycle route through Chiswick High Road, saying CS9 would enhance the road and that businesses would benefit from cycling customers. They supported the plans for Heathfield Terrace and Wellesley Road, saying the changes would encourage less confident people to cycle. They supported most of this plans for South Circular Road (Kew Bridge Station), but were concerned the eastbound cycle lane is not well enough protected from traffic, and that cyclists turning right into Kew Bridge from Kew Bridge Road would not be well catered for. They called for the existing shared-use footway in this area to be better signposted. At Kew Bridge Road / Watermans Park / Brentford High Street (East), the business expressed some concern about junction safety, asking whether cyclists would benefit from advanced traffic lights when continuing east on Brentford High Street at Ealing Road.

**Heathrow Airport (Nelson Road, TW6 2GW)**  
*Strongly supported the proposals*
They called for CS9 to continue to Heathrow Airport to improve transport options for airport workers and other business, and to benefit leisure cycling. They also called for increased cycle parking.

**Lausten-Lehrmann (Nevern Place, SW5 9PR)**
*Supported the proposals*
The architecture firm supported the scheme on environmental grounds but expressed concern about increased congestion. They called for an increase in Cycle Hire bikes and safe cycle parking.

**London Bike Hub (Springfield Road, TW2 6LG)**
*Strongly supported the proposals*
The social enterprise supported the scheme, with calls for cycling infrastructure to be easy to use, safe and future-proof. They highlighted the benefits for reducing congestion and pollution, and providing health, social capital, and other environmental and economic benefits.

**L&Q Housing Association (Grove Crescent Road, E15 1BJ)**
*Strongly supported the proposals (interpreted)*
The association, which owns 90,000 homes in London, said CS9 aligns with their aspirations for residents in their new developments to adopt sustainable modes of transport. They said it is important that transport infrastructure in Brentford is improved to accommodate new residential development in the area, and said they believed that CS9 would alleviate pressure on congested roads and public transport. L&Q called for the scheme to be implemented as soon as possible.

**Now Communications (Barley Mow Passage, W4 4PH)**
*Supported the proposals*
The creative agency said the scheme would benefit its employees, improving conditions for those who cycle already and encouraging those who do not to cycle more. They said CS9 would promote active lifestyles among its employees, which would promote improved mental health, and they said the route would increase spending in local businesses and improve air pollution. They said CS9 would help the business thrive by attracting employees to the area, and by making London a more attractive city. They called for the plans to be delivered quickly.

**Olympia London (Hammersmith Road, W14 8UX)**
*Supported the proposals (interpreted)*
The Olympia Management Team supported the strategic aims of CS9, particularly the improvements to the public realm and the creation of a segregated cycle route. They said this aligns with their aspirations to create a vibrant, mixed-use district at in West London. They expressed concern over some aspects affecting cycling and pedestrian safety, particularly with vehicles turning across cycle tracks. They also raised concerns about the potential impact on commercial motor traffic. They called
for ongoing dialogue between them, TfL the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham to establish whether mitigation measures are necessary for the smooth operation of Olympia and any subsequent developments.

**Outsider Tart (Chiswick High Road, W4 2EF)**

*Strongly opposed the proposals*

In their response to consultation, the bakery opposed changes to parking restrictions, which it stated would negatively affect businesses and residents along the route. They stated that removal of single yellow lines would remove loading for businesses and residents, and that the introduction of parking controls on Sundays and 6-8pm on evenings would remove the opportunity for customers to stop and collect goods from businesses on the route. They raised concern that the route would cost £70m and would only benefit cyclists who do not contribute financially to use the road. They raised concern that cyclists are not licensed, and that the police therefore cannot enforce against anti-social / unlawful behaviour by cyclists. They raised concerns that faster cyclists would not use the cycle track if this was blocked by slower cyclists, and would not be punished for doing so.

The business raised concerns that relocating a bus stop on Chiswick High Road east of Chiswick Lane could result in buses blocking back in an already-congested location. They also expressed concern that the kerb radii at the junction of Chiswick Lane were too severe to allow lorries to turn left from Chiswick Lane onto Chiswick High Road, and that reducing the width of turnings into side streets generally would compromise access for larger vehicles like delivery lorries and refuse collection trucks.

They raised concern that information presented at consultation was conflicting, not easily accessible and referenced information which was not available. They also raised concerns that their business did not receive notification of the consultation or any visit from a TfL representative.

Representatives from the Outsider Tart also raised a number of other points in subsequent emails and a meeting following consultation.

**Pascall and Watson (Eyot Gardens, W6 9TR)**

*Strongly supported the proposals*

The architecture firm supported the scheme, but called for greater connectivity through Kensington & Chelsea, along with improved pedestrian crossings and measures to limit cycling speeds. Expressed concern cyclists would switch to roads in Wellesley Road section of CS9, and that the western section would not be a significant improvement of current cycling facilities.

**Planning Design Partnership (Chiswick Road, W4 3HH)**

*Strongly opposed the proposals*
The business opposed the sections of the scheme in Chiswick High Road and Wellesley Road, claiming the scheme would increase congestion and inconvenience for residents. They called for proposals to be scaled back.

**RATP Dev London (Wellington Road, TW2 5NX)**  
*Strongly opposed the proposals*  
The bus operator opposed reductions in road and footway to accommodate the scheme. They raised concerns that congestion caused by the new stadium for Brentford FC would worsen under the proposals. They stated that as cyclists love using bus lanes, a bus lane should be built from Olympia to Hounslow instead, and suggested this would keep the majority of people happy.

**Saferoading (Church Lane, WD3 8PX)**  
*Strongly opposed the proposals*  
The business opposed the scheme and cast doubt on the effectiveness and value for money of cycling infrastructure in general. They claimed compulsory cyclist training would reduce cycling collisions and offer better value for money, and set out the benefits of their own cycle training programme. They raised concern that cyclists may not respect the rules of the road; that motor vehicles may not be aware of the cycle tracks; that provision may not be made for other road users during construction; and that pedestrians may be adversely impacted.

**Sky UK (Grant Way, TW7 5QD)**  
*Strongly supported the proposals*  
The business supported CS9, saying many employees cycle to work, and that a larger proportion would cycle if they felt safe on the roads. They noted their long and passionate history with cycling, highlighting their partnership with British Cycling which has resulted in over 1.7 million more people cycling now than compared to 2008. They said the scheme would benefit staff and visitors, and called for an extension to Hyde Park in the east and Heathrow Airport in the west.

**The Beauty Know It All (Brackley Terrace, W4 2HJ)**  
*Strongly opposed the proposals*  
This Youtube vlogger offering fashion tips expressed concern the scheme would increase congestion in Chiswick and negatively affect pedestrians.

**X-Electrical (King Street, W6 9JG)**  
*Strongly opposed the proposals*  
This retailer expressed concern at show shops and cafés would be affected by fast-moving cycles near their premises. They asked about parking, and expressed concern that councils could increase rates and have little concern for businesses.

### 4.8 Local interest groups
Argyll & Glyn Co-operative (Hammersmith Road, W14 8QG)

Strongly opposed the proposals
The organisation opposed expenditure on a scheme that it said would only be used during peak hours. They called for a cycle route along the A4 instead, which would be less inconvenient for others, saying cycle routes increase congestion and pollution, and cause danger to pedestrians. They opposed moving a taxi rank from outside Olympia to a residential road, and expressed concern that HGVs would cross the cycle track into Olympia Way and out of Blythe Road. They also expressed concern that the consultation materials covered too big an area.

Bedford Park Society

Opposed the proposals (interpreted)
The society said it welcomed measures to encourage more walking and cycling, but opposed the scheme due to the impact on residents. They said a survey of members showed a majority opposed the scheme. Key concerns raised were the safety of pedestrians crossing Chiswick High Road, particularly with a two-way cycle track and faster cycling. They expressed concern that CS9 would detract from the “village” status of Chiswick, with a detrimental effect on its café culture and pedestrians. They expressed concern the scheme would adversely affect businesses and the local Catholic Church, including during construction. They highlight LCDS guidance that two-way tracks are less suitable for high streets and that cycle tracks should not take space from footways. They expressed concern about traffic displacement into nearby minor roads (such as Duke’s Avenue, South Parade and Bath Road) and about increased congestion and pollution in Chiswick High Road. They doubted the results of the traffic modelling, and express concerns about slower buses. They objected to changes to bus stops, loading, bus lanes and single yellow lines. They suggested local cycling journeys would not benefit from the scheme, and questioned cycling predictions and traffic counts. To benefit cycling safety, the society called for improvements major junctions and for a separate cycle route along the A4. They also called for measures to reduce car use such as improvements to public transport.

Brackenbury Residents’ Association

Opposed the proposals (interpreted)
The association objected to the proposals. They criticised the consultation drop-in event at the Cross Keys, saying it was confusing, too small and poorly lit. They said CS9 needed to acknowledge the priority of people over cycles. They expressed concern about increased congestion and pollution, and called for CS9 to be re-designed and presented for consultation again.

Brentford Chamber of Commerce (Hamilton Road, TW8 0QF)

Strongly opposed the proposals
The organisation opposed CS9, saying a reduction in carriageway space would increase congestion and pollution, and damage commerce and leisure. They stated they welcome improvements to the street environment. They expressed concern the
scheme would stop in Brentford High Street at a point that is narrow and congested. They stated it seemed illogical to encourage cycling in Brentford when future developments will cause an increase in tipper lorries to facilitate construction. They called for future developments in this area to provide improved facilities for parking, loading and buses. They called for the route to follow the A4, with spurs to reach local high streets. They opposed bus stop bypasses, saying these would adversely affect pedestrian safety, particularly for wheelchair users. They said they could not understand the plans sufficiently well to see whether road space would be taken from loading bays or bus lanes, opposing any reductions in these. They claimed that other Cycle Superhighways had increased journey times for motor traffic.

Brentford Community Council (Brook Road South, TW8 0NP)

*Strongly opposed the proposals*

The group said they had submitted a Freedom of Information (FOI) request to find out when traffic counts were carried out because they said they believed these had been done during school holidays. They said they would publish their FOI findings on receipt. They expressed concern that consultants at public events did not offer sufficiently detailed responses to queries posed.

Brentford Towers Residents’ Association (Green Dragon Lane, TW8 0DF)

*Opposed the proposals*

The association claimed the scheme in Brentford would cause more collisions and additional congestion and pollution. They called for all traffic to use the Capital Interchange to access the M4 or the A4 or to use Chiswick Roundabout instead of Lionel Road South. They asked for more evidence on the safety of bus stop bypasses, which they said would endanger pedestrians with reduced mobility and children. They also asked for more details on how a cycle track would affect pedestrians using Watermans Park, and stated this should seek to reduce hazards pedestrians face as cyclists come past.

British Grove Group (British Grove, W4 2NL)

*Strongly opposed the proposals (interpreted)*

The group opposed the measures proposed for British Grove, and called for the retention of the existing one-way system. They called for new traffic signals for turning traffic at the junction of British Grove and Chiswick High Road and King Street, including a cycle-specific phase to improve cycle safety. They also proposed measures to reduce U-turns and called for the resurfacing of British Grove. They group expressed concern about the changes negatively affecting safety for all road users, particularly pedestrians and cyclists using British Grove, and that the changes would increasing localised air pollution.

Chiswick High Road Action Group (Chiswick High Road, W4 4EU)

*Neither supported nor opposed the proposals (interpreted)*
The group said it did not support or oppose CS9, though it strongly supports a segregated cycle superhighway on the south side of Chiswick High Road. They expressed concern the route does go far enough in implementing the Mayor for London’s strategic goals set out in his 2017 Draft Transport Strategy, reducing dependency on cars and promoting cycling and walking. They called for space for a cycle track to be created by reducing space for motor vehicles rather than pedestrians, and for the route to be extended to Chiswick Business Park or Chiswick Roundabout. Specifically, they called for increased footway space near Our Lady of Grace Church and British Grove, with the likely outcome a better preservation of Chiswick’s café culture and cleaner air.

Cambridge Grove and Leamore Street Residents’ Association (Cambridge Grove, W6 OLA)

*Strongly opposed the proposals*

The association responded on behalf of 60 residents living near the Hammersmith one-way system. They opposed the scheme, saying it would be disruptive and increase pollution due to slow-moving motor traffic. They also expressed concern about pedestrian safety in the town centre. They claimed the council was not aware of the scheme and thought it could have been considered alongside the Central Hammersmith Plan.

Digby Mansions Residents’ Association (Hammersmith Bridge Road, W6 9DF)

*Strongly opposed the proposals (interpreted)*

The organisation opposed with the scheme, saying they agreed with the comments provided by the Hammersmith Society and the Hammersmith Mall Residents’ Association (see below). They raised concerns that CS9 would be a commuter route for cyclists and would make Hammersmith Road, King Street and Chiswick High Road unpleasant and unsafe. They raised concerns that pedestrians would have to cross a two-way cycle track, particularly at bus stops. The organisation stated proposals would increase congestion, rat-running and pollution, and suggested that CS9 should be re-routed to the A4.

The Fulham Society (Rosaville Road, SW6 7BN)

*Opposed the proposals (interpreted)*

The society claimed that Cycle Superhighways encourage high-speed long-distance commuter cycling and would not benefit town centres. They expressed concern this type of cycling intimidates pedestrians and slower cyclists. They objected to any reduction in footway width, and restrictions on stopping or parking, and negative impacts on congestion and pollution. They expressed concern that proposals would narrow King Street, thereby removing the potential for two vehicles to pass one another while loading or in an emergency. They stated this would increase congestion and journey times for buses. They supported improvements to pedestrian
crossings. They objected to bus stop bypasses, as disadvantaging the elderly or those with pushchairs.

**Glebe Estates Residents’ Association (Duke Road, W4 2DE)**

*Strongly opposed the proposals (interpreted)*

The association opposed restrictions to turning movements between Chiswick High Road and Duke Road/Duke’s Avenue, stating these would increase motor traffic in Duke Road, Devonshire Road and Bourne Place and increase congestion in Chiswick High Road between Annandale Road and Sutton Court Road. They claimed the CS9 priority proposed here would add to danger and congestion. As an alternative to the new one-way roads, the association called for traffic lights at the junction of Duke Road, Chiswick High Road and Fisher’s Lane, either in addition to or replacing lights at Duke’s Avenue. They suggested these lights could work also with the proposed one-way changes. They expressed concern that CS9 would increase pedestrian danger in Chiswick High Road, including for school children and people using mobility scooters. They called for greater enforcement against law-breaking cyclists, and expressed concern about wider-area increases in pollution.

**Grove House Residents’ Association (British Grove, W4 2NL)**

*Strongly opposed the proposals (interpreted)*

The association objected to the scheme based on the perceived impact on traffic flow, and pedestrian and cycle safety in and around British Grove. They drew attention to potential issues around reversing the British Grove one-way system, including waste removal and access to certain driveways and for emergency vehicles. They also expressed concern about increased danger for pedestrians using British Grove (providing pedestrian counts) including residents. The association called for retention of the existing traffic flow in British Grove, along with new traffic signals at the junction of British Grove and Chiswick High Road / Kings Street, including cycle-specific phases and measures to prevent U-turns. They also called for the road to be resurfaced.

**Grove Park Group Residents’ Association (Grove Park Road, W4 3SD)**

*Opposed the proposals*

The association said the scheme would not benefit Chiswick residents, being primarily for commuter cycling. They said a network of radial cycle routes in the area would be more beneficial. They also called for public transport to better accommodate cycling.

They stated that adding a cycle lane to Hammersmith Road made sense as it is already a main route into the centre of London. They also stated that they would prefer CS9 and through trips to be made on the A4 and that cyclists making local trips be encouraged to use King Street and Chiswick High Road instead. The association requested more data on the origin and destination of trips around Chiswick High Road and how many could be switched to cycling from mechanised
modes. They called for measures to reduce traffic volumes on Chiswick High Road, and suggested a new flyover at Hogarth Roundabout. They supported proposals for CS9 at the South Circular and stated there is no obvious alternative to using this section to link CS9 to the A4. The association expressed concern that the consultation materials did not consider the A4 in more detail.

**Hammersmith Broadway Safer Neighbourhoods Panel**

*Opposed the proposals (interpreted)*

The organisation questioned some details of the proposals. They said the two crossings between Hammersmith Broadway and Hammersmith Road (via an island) should be marked as pedestrian-only, not shared with cyclists. They objected to the proposed layout where the cycle track crosses King Street near MacBeth Street, saying that a cycle crossing next to a pedestrian crossing would be confusing for all road users. They objected to the narrowing of footways in King Street, and to bus stop bypasses, saying they would be dangerous to those with reduced mobility.

They expressed concern that CS9 would attract high-speed cyclists who would not stop at signals. The organisation called for changes to shared pedestrian-cycle crossings near the Hammersmith Apollo and the junction at the Fulham Palace Road to make them safer. They suggested the southern end of Hammersmith Gyratory should be improved as part of proposals for CS9, and requested that CS9 be diverted alignments along Black’s Road and the A4, along with the south of Butterwick and under the flyover. They suggested CS9 would be incompatible with Hammersmith and Fulham Council’s plans to develop a new public square in front of the Town Hall. They welcomed new separated crossings at the gyratory for pedestrians and cyclists.

**Hammersmith Grove Residents’ Association (Hammersmith Grove, W6 0NP)**

*Strongly opposed the proposals*

The association opposed a reduction in carriageway space in King Street, and expressed concern about potential increases in motor traffic in surrounding roads. They claimed new traffic signals in Beadon Road would delay motor traffic, and opposed a new bus stop near Hammersmith Grove. They called for new Cycle Superhighways to be accompanied by reductions in motor traffic across London by expanding the Low Emission and Congestion Charge zones to Zones 2 and 3. They stated Glenthorne Road was not an option for a Cycle Superhighway either, and raised concerns that proposals would decrease house prices and residents’ health. They called for TfL to consider all consequences of proposals before consulting on them.

**Hammersmith Mall Residents’ Association (Hammersmith Bridge Road, W6 9DF)**

*Opposed the proposals*
The association opposed the proposals, saying it would be disruptive to people using King Street and Chiswick, and likely to cause congestion and pollution. They said the scheme would make it harder for people to cross the road and catch a bus, and that they would prefer improvements along the A4 and Glenthorne Road where there are fewer pedestrians and a route would be less disruptive.

**Hammersmith Society (Becklow Gardens, W12 9EU)**

*Strongly opposed the proposals (interpreted)*

The society objected to the scheme. They claimed consultation publicity was poor and letters were not sent to a wide enough area. Sections of the response used similar text as submitted by the Winslow Amenity Group (see below), including comments on trees, the A4, the earlier Hammersmith consultation, commuter cycling, congestion, and pedestrian safety.

The society welcomed improvements to pedestrian crossings. They expressed concern about the impact on bus passengers, particularly the elderly and school children, as well as the use of bus stop bypasses. They said congestion would increase pollution and the closing of some side roads such as British Grove would be disruptive to local residents and businesses. They expressed concern about vehicles crossing the cycle track to access other side roads. They also stated they had not yet commented on some of the detailed aspects of the proposal.

**Holy Trinity Hounslow (Lampton Park Road, TW3 4HS)**

*Strongly supported the proposals*

The church called for CS9 to be extended into Hounslow, saying the scheme would benefit people living in poorer neighbourhoods, help make the Hounslow area more attractive and reduce pollution.

**Kew Bridge Owners Association (Kew Bridge Road, TW3 4HS)**

*Opposed the proposals (interpreted)*

The association said it represented owners of more than 300 apartments the Kew Bridge development. They expressed concern about increased congestion around Kew Bridge Road, particularly around Kew Bridge Station, exacerbated by new developments such as those at Brentford Football Stadium and events at Kew Gardens, Twickenham and other locations. They called for further investigations into the impact on congestion, access, air quality, effects on public transport, access for emergency services, general public safety and the economy. They expressed concern about egress on to Kew Bridge Road from near 8 Kew Bridge Road, including assurance that Keep Clear signs would be retained at the car park access opposite Green Dragon Lane. They opposed the new bus lane on Kew Bridge Road due to the impact on general traffic travelling east on Kew Bridge Road. They suggested moving the bus stop further west to the other side of Green Dragon Lane. They called for construction impacts to be minimised, particularly access.
Linden Gardens Residents’ Association (Linden Gardens, W4 2EQ)

*Strongly opposed the proposals*

The association supported the aims of CS9, but opposed the scheme based on a lack of assessment of its impact and poor local knowledge on the part of the team implementing the scheme. They questioned the authenticity of the consultation because it over-represented the views of non-local cycling Londoners. They claimed the two-way cycle track would disadvantage groups protected by equalities legislation, in particular pedestrians with reduced mobility such as older and disabled people. They called for wider consultation with residents and an extension to the consultation period.

The association expressed concern that the scheme would reduce property values in their road because residents would have to cross the two-way cycle track to access Chiswick High Road, and that narrowing the exit of Linden Gardens would reduce sight lines and increase driver frustration. They expressed concern that existing rat-running in Linden Gardens would increase due to CS9, and that parking would become more difficult due to parking changes in Chiswick High Road. They expressed concern about reduced emergency access and increased pollution caused by longer journeys due to congestion and/or one-way roads. They called for the CS9 budget to be spent on other parts of the cycle network, and an extension of residents’ parking to cover Sundays. They raised concern that the consultation had missed out local businesses and certain streets, and suggested it should have been longer and made more material available.

London Forum of Amenity and Civic Societies

*Strongly opposed the proposals*

The forum expressed strong support for the principle of making cycling safer, but objected to CS9. They highlighted the LCDS guidance that recommends not using a two-way track in a town centre or to take space from pedestrians. They highlighted a perceived disparity between Department for Transport cycle counts and those from TfL, and comments from Kensington and Chelsea Council against CS9 in the borough. They said CS9 would benefit commuter cycling, which is incompatible with town centres, and objected to delays caused by the removal of bus lanes and use of bus stop bypasses. The forum expressed concern that businesses would have to reduce outdoor seating to accommodate the cycle track, and deliveries would become more difficult. They called for CS9 to be delayed until 2030, when motor traffic levels would likely have decreased to an acceptable level.

The forum also expressed concern that CS9 would cause increased journey times, congestion and pollution. They also expressed concerns that bus stops would be relocated, and that a mature tree in Watermans Park would be removed. They raised concern that no segregation was proposed for cyclists on Wellesley Road and Heathfield Terrace, and suggested that CS9 be routed on the A4 instead. They expressed concern that CS9 did not co-ordinate with new developments which would
bring increased traffic to the area, and that traffic restrictions at Wellesley Road and Stile Hall Gardens could increase traffic on Oxford Road North and Chiswick High Road. The forum objected to changes to turning restrictions proposed at British Grove and to the proposed advanced stop line for cyclists at Turnham Green Terrace. The forum raised concern over reduced parking and loading facilities, and stated the proposed cycle track adjacent the footway would worsen the quality of life for pedestrians.

Mornington Avenue Mansions Freehold (Mornington Avenue, W14 8UW)

*Strongly opposed the proposals*

The organisation objected to the reallocation of road space to cycling, claiming there would be additional congestion and pollution caused by queueing motor traffic. They said the scheme discriminate against people who they said cannot ride bikes: older people, people with disabilities, expectant mothers and children. They claimed existing Cycle Superhighways are not well used and have caused extra congestion. They suggested the road network was not being properly managed due to increasing journey times, and called for the money to be spent on public transport instead. They also questioned the safety of segregated tracks, with pedestrians likely to cause collisions with cycles.

St Paul's Church, Ealing (Elers Road, W13 9QE)

*Strongly supported the proposals*

The church said CS9 was a real step forward.

St Peter’s Residents’ Association (St Peter’s Square, W6 9AB)

*Strongly opposed the proposals (interpreted)*

The association said it supported cycling in principle, but objected to CS9 going through King Street, Chiswick High Road and the surrounding area. They said CS9 would damage trade and opposed the cycle route and any proposed banned turns.

They suggested a cycle route along the A4 would be better than encouraging cycling through an area with many side streets, shops, restaurants, schools and homes. They objected to bus lane removal and bus stop bypasses; removal of six trees; and increased pollution. They opposed changes around British Grove, saying these would negatively affect residents and pedestrians. They expressed concern CS9 would damage the local café culture and make deliveries difficult.

Thornton-Mayfield Residents’ Association (Thornton Avenue, W4 1QG)

*Strongly opposed the proposals*

The association said the scheme would destroy the unique character of Chiswick. They raised concerns that proposals would remove trees and planters, narrow pavements and reduce the number of businesses with outdoor seating, and stated this would be of detriment to the Conservation Area.
They expressed concerns that proposals would reduce opportunities to park on single yellow lines, and stated this would increase demand for parking in nearby streets. They also raised concerns that converting zebra crossings to signalised (green man) crossings would increase congestion.

They also expressed concern that the consultation material made it difficult to understand the impacts on the quality of life locally.

**Winslow Road Amenity Group (Winslow Road, W6 9SF)**

*Opposed the proposals (interpreted)*

The group opposed the scheme and said letters should have been sent to more residents. They claimed CS9 and other Cycle Superhighways increase pollution. They objected to the loss of six mature trees, and claimed others would be endangered by the proposed cycle track. They said there would be insufficient space for café tables in Chiswick. They requested alternative routes for CS9 be considered, and said pollution and side road turnings were not good enough reasons to not route CS9 along the A4.

They said a 2016 consultation on cycle routes through Hammersmith Broadway was flawed. They claimed the scheme would only benefit fast commuter cycling, which would have negative impacts town centres and on pedestrians and people who cycle more slowly. They opposed any negative impact on buses and the installation of bus stop bypasses. They opposed any closures to motor traffic on side roads such as British Grove. They raised concerns that King Street would no longer be wide enough for vehicles to pass, and stated this would increase congestion and pollution. They called for CS9 to be considered as part of wider plans for the borough and Hammersmith Broadway.

**4.9 Schools**

**Latymer Upper School / West London Free School**

*Opposed the proposals (interpreted)*

Both schools said they promote sustainability and encourage staff and pupils to walk or cycle to school, but they objected to proposals for CS9. They claimed CS9 would have an adverse effect on the safety of school staff and pupils, and that school buses stopped in the carriageway near the schools would negatively affect motor traffic in King Street. The schools provided survey data demonstrating that large numbers of staff and students use the school entrances, particularly during morning and evening peak hours, but also at other times. School buses park in the bus lane near the school outside its operational hours.

They objected to changes to signalised pedestrian crossings and bus stops near the school, saying the use of informal crossings would increase risk to people attending the schools. They also expressed concern about overcrowding at crossing, which
could be made worse by moving bus stops. They expressed concern about vehicles entering and leaving the school across the cycle track, about relocating bus stops further from the schools, and stated the 0-5 minute increases predicted to bus journey times for route 27 could result in pupils being late for school. The schools asked for information on alternative alignments for CS9, which they would have liked to see included as part of the consultation.

Ravenscourt Park Preparatory School
Opposed the proposals (interpreted)
The school said it promoted sustainability and encouraged staff and pupils to walk, scooter or cycle to school, but they objected to CS9. They supported the issues raised in the responses of Latymer Upper School and West London Free School, noting that their pupils frequently cross the road to visit Latymer Upper School to use their swimming pool. They stated they use coaches to transport pupils and staff, and raised concern that coaches from Laytmer Upper School, the West London Free School and Ravenscourt Park Preparatory School would be parked on both sides of King Street under the proposals, as coaches are not permitted to use Ravenscourt Avenue.
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Kuehne + Nagel
Kwasi Kwarteng MP

Larmenier and Sacred Heart Catholic School
Larmenier and Sacred Heart RC Primary School
Learning Disabled Service User
Len Duvall AM
Lena Gardens Primary School
Leonard Cheshire Disability
Leonie Cooper AM
Licenced Private Hire Car Association
Licenced Taxi Drivers Association
Licensed Taxi Drivers Association
Little Muffins Nursery
Living Streets
London Ambulance Service
London Association of Funeral Directors
London Bike Hub
London Borough of Barking and Dagenham
London Borough of Barnet
London Borough of Bexley
London Borough of Brent
London Borough of Bromley
London Borough of Bromley
London Borough of Camden
London Borough of Croydon
London Borough of Ealing
London Borough of Enfield
London Borough of Hackney
London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham
London Borough of Haringey
London Borough of Harrow
London Borough of Havering
London Borough of Hillingdon
London Borough of Hounslow
London Borough of Islington
London Borough of Lambeth
London Borough of Lewisham
London Borough of Merton
London Borough of Newham
London Borough of Redbridge
London Borough of Richmond-Upon-Thames
London Borough of Southwark
London Borough of Sutton
London Borough of Tower Hamlets
London Borough of Waltham Forest
London Borough of Wandsworth
London Borough of Wandsworth and Hounslow
London Borough of Richmond
London Borough of Westminster
London Bridge Team
London Cab Drivers Club
London Chamber of Commerce and Industry
London City Airport
London Councils
London Cycling Campaign
London Cycling Campaign (Hammersmith and Fulham)
London Cycling Campaign (Hounslow)
London Cycling Campaign (Hillingdon)
London Cycling Campaign (Kensington and Chelsea)
London Cycling Campaign (Kingston)
London Cycling Campaign (Richmond)
London European Partnership for Transport
London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority
London Fire Brigade
London Fire Brigade Service
London First
London General
London Gypsies and Travellers
London Older People's Strategy Group
London Omnibus Traction Society
London Private Hire Board
London Region National Pensioners Convention
London Riverside
London Strategic Health Authority
London Suburban Taxi-drivers' Coalition
London TravelWatch
London United Busways
London Visual Impairment Forum
London Wetland Centre (South)
London Wetland Centre, Richmond
London Wildlife Trust
Look Ahead
Loomis UK
Love Wimbledon
Lupus UK
Lyn Brown MP
Manor Grove Residents Association.
Richmond
Margaret Hodge MP
Mark Field MP
Marks and Spencer
Marks and Spencer (Food)
Martin-Brower UK
Matthew Offord MP
Matthew Pennycook MP
McNicholas
Meg Hillier MP
Melcombe Primary School
Mencap
Metrobus
Metroline Travel Limited/ Metroline West Limited
Metropolitan Police Heathrow Airport
Metropolitan Police
Metropolitan Police - Community Police
Michael Fallon MP
Mike Freer MP
Mike Gapes MP
MIND
Mission Hall Community Group
MITIE
Mobile Cycle Training Service
Mode Transport
Monica Tross MP
Motorcycle Action Group
Motorcycle Action Group (MAG)
Motorcycle Industry Association
MS Society
Multiple Sclerosis Society Hounslow Branch
National Autistic Society
National Children's Bureau
National Express
National Grid
National Motorcycle Council
Navin Shah AM
Network MESH West London
New Chiswick Pool
New West End
New West End Company
NHS Ambulance Services - West London
NHS London
No Panic
Normand Croft Community School
North End Medical Centre
North West London Hospitals NHS Trust
Northbank BID
Norwood Green Residents' Association
Nutmeg
NWEC

Ocean Youth Connexions
Office Depot
Old Chiswick Protection Society
Oliver Dowden MP
On Your Bike Cycle Training
One World Preparatory School
Onkar Sahota AM
Orchard House School
Osterley and Wyke Green Residents Association
Our Lady of Victories Church

Paddington Residents Active Concern On Transport
Pan-London Dementia Alliance
Parents Active LBHF
Park Medical Centre
Parkinson's UK
Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety
Paul Scully MP
Pembroke Place Residents Association
Peter Whittle AM
Petts Wood and District RA
Philip Kemp Cycle Training
Pimlico FREDAB
Planning Design
Port of London Authority
Powerscroft Road Initiative for Neighbourhood Community and Environment
Private Hire Board
Putney BID
Putney Society
Putney Traffic Transport and Parking Working Group
Puzzle Focus

Queen Mary University of London
Queen's Manor Primary School

Quinton Court Tenants and Residents Association
RAC
RAC Motoring Foundation
Radio Taxis
Rail Delivery Group
Ravenscourt Park Preparatory School
Raynes Park and West Barnes Residents' Association
RC Church of St Dunstan
Reigate and Banstead Council
Residents Society of Mayfair and St James's
Reynolds
Richard Harrington MP
Richford Gate Medical Practice
Richmond and Kingston Accessible Transport
Richmond BID
Richmond Safer Transport Team
Riverford
RMT London Taxi
RMT Union
RNIB
Road Danger Reduction Forum
Road Haulage Association
Road Haulage Association
Roadpeace
Robert Neill MP
Rosena Allin-Khan MP
Royal Borough of Greenwich
Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames
Royal Institute of British Architects
Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors
Royal London Society for Blind People
Royal Mail Group
Royal MailParcel Force
Royal Society of Blind Children
Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI)
Runnymede Borough Council
Rupa Huq MP
Rushanara Ali MP
Ruth Cadbury MP

Sacred Heart High School
Safety Net People First LBHF
Sainsbury's Supermarkets
Saint Augustine's Catholic Church
Sam Gyimah MP
Scope
Seema Malhotra MP
SeLVIS
Sense
Sensory Disability Team (Hounslow)
Shaun Bailey AM
Sian Berry AM
Siobhain McDonagh MP
Sir John Lillie Primary School
SITA UK
Sixty Plus
Slough Borough Council
Smiths News
Snowflake School
Social Work Team for Children with Disabilities (Hounslow)
Soho Society
South Bank Employers’ Group
South Bermondsey Partnership
South Bucks CycleTraining
South East Bayswater Residents Association
South East London Vision
Space Syntax
Spokes Cycling Instruction
St Alban’s Fulham
St Andrew’s Church
St Anne’s Church Kew
St Augustine’s RC Primary School
St Barnabas and St Philip’s CE Primary School
St Germans Terrace Association
St Helen’s Residents’ Association
St James Junior School
St Joseph Catholic Church
St Mark’s Coptic Orthodox Church
St Mary Church of England
St Mary’s RC Primary School
St Mary’s West Kensington
St Michael and All Angels Church
St Michael’s Church Chiswick
St Paul’s CE Primary School
St Paul’s Church Grove Park
St Paul’s Girls School
St Paul’s Hammersmith
St Paul’s School Colet Court
St Peter’s CE Primary School
St Peter’s Hammersmith
St Simons Church
St Thomas
St Thomas of Canterbury RC Primary School
Strand-on-the-Green Junior School
Station to Station
Stella Creasy MP
Stephen Timms MP
Stephen Hammond MP
Stephen Pound MP
Sterndale Surgery
Steve Reed MP
Steve O’Connell AM
Strand On The Green Association
Strategic Access Panel
Stratford Original
Strawberry Hill Neighbourhood Association
Sullivan Bus and Coach
Surrey County Council
Sustrans
Team London Bridge
Technicolour Tyre Company
Teresa Pearce MP
Thames Water
Thamesmead Business Services
The Advocacy Project
The Association of Guide Dogs for the Blind
The Big Bus Company
The British Dyslexia Association
The British Motorcyclists’ Federation
The Bush Doctors
The Canal and River Trust
The Clubhouse
The Co-operative Group
The Driver-Guides Association
The Falcons Schools for Boys
The Fulham Boys School
The Godolphin and Latymer School
The Good Shepherd RC Primary School
The Langton Way Residents Association
The London Legacy Development Corporation
The Original Tour
The Royal Parks
The St Marylebone Society
The West Chiswick and Gunnersbury Society
The Westcombe Society
Theresa Villiers MP
Thomas Brake MP
Thomas Pocklington Trust
Thomas’ Academy
Thorney Island Society
Thornton Mayfield Residents Association
TKMaxx
TNT
Tollard House Residents Association
Tomlinson Close
Tony Devenish AM
Tony Devenish AM
Tour Guides
Tower Transit Operations
TPH for Heathrow Airport
Tradeteam
Trailblazers, Muscular Dystrophy UK
Transport Focus
Transport for All
Travis Perkins
Troy Court Residents Association
Try Twickenham
Tulip Siddiq MP
Turnham Green Terrace Residents Ass
Twickenham Park Residents' Association
Tyssen Community School Cycle Training
Uber
UK Power Networks
Unions Together
Unite the Union
Unite the Union London Central Cab
Section
Unite Union
University College Hospital
University College London
Universitybus / UNO
Unknown
Unmesh Desai AM
UPS
Urban Movement
Uxbridge and South Ruislip
Valuing People (TfL's learning disability group)

Vandome Cycles
Vicky Foxcroft MP
Victoria BID

Victoria Business Improvement District
Virendra Sharma MP
Virtual Norwood Forum
Vision 2020
Visually Impaired Children

Walk London
Warwick Gardens Residents Association
Waterloo Quarter
Wellesley Road Surgery
Wes Streeting MP
West Chiswick and Gunnersbury Society
West London Alliance
West London Disability Partnership
West London Free School
West London Free School Primary
West London River Group
Westside School
Westway Community Transport
Wheels for Wellbeing
Whitbread Group
Whizz-Kidz
William Morris Sixth Form
Willow Lane BID
Wilson James
Wilson’s Cycles
Wincanton Group
Windmill Road Residents Association
www.cyclinginstructor.com

Young Lewisham and Greenwich Cyclists
Zac Goldsmith MP
Appendix F: Overall support for the proposals by postcode

Of the 5,388 respondents to the consultation, 4,523 (84 per cent of all respondents) submitted their postcode. We received responses from 2,846 unique postcodes.

Section 3.4 summarises the number of responses received by postcode district and postcode sector.

The tables below show the level of support and opposition to the overall proposals for postcode districts and sectors provided by 20 or more respondents. We have provided the percentage support where the total response is greater than 100.

### Postcode district

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postcode district</th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neithr support nor oppose</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W14</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW8</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W12</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW7</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage shown where the total response is greater than 100
Postcode sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postcode sector</th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Neither support nor oppose</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W4 2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 3</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4 5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6 0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6 9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW8 0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W12 9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W14 0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W14 8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W6 7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W14 9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW8 8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW7 6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3 8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5 4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3 7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W13 9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW8 9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW7 5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5 3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW9 2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW13 9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3 9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW13 0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W12 8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W12 0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5 1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW7 4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW9 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W12 7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage shown where the total response is greater than 100
Appendix G: Detailed analysis of comments
Overall proposals

Respondents were asked to comment on the overall proposals. 3,872 of the 5,388 respondents provided comments on the overall proposals for CS9 and the issues raised are shown below. Percentages are calculated from the overall number of respondents and where above one per cent have been rounded. Only comments that occurred more than twice are included.

General comments are presented first. Other comments have been grouped into the categories below listed in order of how frequently they were mentioned

**General**

**Principles of the scheme**

**Impact on pedestrians**

**Impact on motorists**

**Cycle infrastructure**

**Impact on cyclists**

**Environmental impacts**

**Cyclist behaviour**

**Scope of scheme**

**Impact on bus users**

**Junctions**

**Impact on churches**

**Safety**

**Policy**

**Complementary measures**

**Construction impacts**

**Impacts on schools**
General

There were 1,398 general comments about the overall proposals, including:

- 782 (13 per cent) respondents made a general comment in support of the scheme such as “great”
- 179 (3 per cent) respondents made a general comment opposing the scheme such as “bad idea”
- 110 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the proposals for Chiswick High Road
- 84 (2 per cent) respondents said they were opposed to the proposals for Chiswick High Road
- 71 (1 per cent) respondents said they considered the scheme should be built as soon as possible
- 22 (< 1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the proposals for King Street
- 15(< 1 per cent) respondents said they supported the proposals for Hammersmith Road
- 11 (< 1 per cent) respondents said they supported the proposals for Hammersmith Gyratory due to safety benefits
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that that scheme has not properly been thought out
- 7(< 1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the proposals for Hammersmith Road
- 6(<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the proposals for Kew Bridge
- 3(<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the proposals for Brentford

Principles of the scheme

1677 (31 per cent) respondents commented on the principles of the scheme. These comments have been divided into the following categories: prioritisation of modes, uptake of cycling, Cycle Superhighways, health, accessibility, cycle network, conservation of the area, uptake of walking, public transport, future proposals and new developments.

Prioritisation of modes

546 (10 per cent) respondents commented on prioritisation of modes, including:

- 211 (4 per cent) respondents said they opposed prioritising cyclists over other transport modes such as motorists, bus users or pedestrians
- 52 (1 per cent) respondents said they supported active travel over cars
• 47 (<1 per cent) respondents said they opposed the scheme as changes were not needed to accommodate cyclists
• 46 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the scheme encourages cyclist commuter through traffic but does not account for needs of local cycle traffic
• 44 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were opposed to cycling in London
• 37 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested prioritising public transport
• 26 (<1 per cent) respondents stated concern there is insufficient space for all road users
• 16 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested pedestrians should be prioritised
• 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were opposed to the scheme in Chiswick High Road as changes are not needed to accommodate cyclists
• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned that scheme does not benefit motorists or pedestrians
• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned there is insufficient space for all road users in Chiswick High Road
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned that the scheme prioritises a minority of road users
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support prioritising environmentally friendly public transport
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested efforts are concentrated on road maintenance to improve cycling conditions rather than building a Cycle Superhighway
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support cycling benefits outweighing traffic impacts
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that scheme should not be implemented at the expense of other modes
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned there is insufficient space for all road users at King Street
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were opposed to the reallocation of road space

Uptake of cycling

547 (10 per cent) respondents commented on the implications of the scheme for the uptake of cycling, including:

• 435 (8 per cent) respondents said they support encouraging people to cycle and/ or the scheme as it will encourage more people to cycle
• 74 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cycle tracks will be underused
• 27 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cycle tracks will be ineffective in achieving mode shift
11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned proposals do not do enough to encourage cyclists of all ages and abilities

**Cycle Superhighways**

143 (3 per cent) respondents commented on Cycle Superhighways in general.

- 44 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that Cycle Superhighways encourage speeding
- 37 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that lessons learned from earlier Cycle Superhighways are incorporated into designs
- 23 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that other Cycle Superhighway areas are worse than before
- 22 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported the scheme based on successes of previous Cycle Superhighways
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported the use of cycle routes over Cycle Superhighways
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents stated they were concerned the Cycle Superhighway brand has negative connotations
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they suggested lessons learned from schemes in other cities should be incorporated into designs

**Health**

114 (2 per cent) respondents were supportive of the proposals due to the positive impacts on health.

**Accessibility**

72 (1 per cent) respondents commented on accessibility issues of the principles of the scheme, including:

- 59 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the scheme was not suitable/dangerous for young/elderly people
- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents stated they were concerned that the scheme was not suitable for people with disabilities/illnesses
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cycling is not a viable alternative for parents with children

**Cycle network**

70 (1 per cent) respondents commented on the issues relating to the overall cycle network, including:

- 69 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that scheme doesn't connect to the cycle network in Hyde Park and wider London
Conservation of the area

60 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the history, tradition or feel of the area will be negatively affected. Note as these comments were made in the overall proposals section no specific area was mentioned.

Uptake of walking

39 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the scheme as it will encourage more journeys to be made on foot.

Public transport

24 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to public transport, including:

- 16 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the proposals should not affect public transport services
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported the scheme as it will reduce pressure on public transport

Future proposals

12 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the proposed Brentford to Hounslow extension should be consulted on.

New developments

11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned new building developments have not been considered in scheme.

Impact on pedestrians

1,359 (25 per cent) respondents commented on the impacts on pedestrians. These comments have been divided into the following categories: safety, walking space, vulnerable groups, crossings, impact on residents, signage and markings.

Safety

430 (32 per cent) respondents commented on safety aspects of the scheme, including:

- 174 (3 per cent) respondents said they were concerned Cycle Superhighways pose danger to pedestrians due to speed of cyclists/proximity of pavement to cycle tracks
- 102 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned for pedestrian safety (general comment)
- 89 (2 per cent) respondents were concerned about pedestrian cyclist conflict
• 20 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the proposals which would improve pedestrian safety
• 16 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that pedestrians would walk into cycle tracks without looking
• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned there would be a increased risk posed to pedestrians from two-way running
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned excessive traffic speeds pose a risk to residents
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned excessive traffic speeds pose a risk to residents at Stile Hall Gardens
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned current traffic levels pose a risk to children

Walking space

413 respondents commented on issues relating to walking space, including:

• 115 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over the reduction of walking space on Chiswick High Road
• 109 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over the reduction of walking space in general
• 43 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the needs of pedestrians should be considered
• 42 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned reallocation of footpaths will increase pedestrian congestion, and make it less enjoyable to walk along Chiswick High Road
• 39 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the cycle track will cause severance between north and south sides of road at Chiswick High Road
• 24 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that reducing pavement space will mean less space for mothers with baby strollers and buggies on Chiswick High Road
• 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the reallocation of footpaths will increase pedestrian congestion in general
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported the scheme as it will be beneficial for pedestrians
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they considered that the proposals falsely claim improvements to pedestrian environment in Chiswick
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned over reduction of walking space at British Grove
Vulnerable groups

306 (6 per cent) respondents commented on concerns for vulnerable people from the proposals, including:

- 110 (2 per cent) respondents mentioned children
- 105 (2 per cent) respondents mentioned elderly people
- 76 (1 per cent) respondents mentioned disabled people
- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents mentioned visually impaired people

Crossings

115 (2 per cent) respondents commented on issues about crossings, including:

- 64 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals will make it more difficult to cross the road
- 38 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned the proposals will make it more difficult to cross the road in Chiswick High Road
- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the use of continuous pedestrian crossings
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned slower walking pedestrians will not have enough time to cross track and road

Impact on residents

62 (1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on residents, including:

- 58 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that Cycle Superhighways negatively impact residents which live near the cycle tracks
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the proposal would negatively impact residents which live near the cycle tracks in Chiswick Village

Signage and markings

18 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the infrastructure should clearly delineate areas for cyclists and pedestrians

Impact on motorists

1312 (24 per cent) respondents commented on the impacts on motorists. These comments have been divided into the following categories: congestion, road layout and parking, journey times, access and through traffic, emergency services, crossing the track, demand management.
Congestion

866 (16 per cent) respondents commented on the implications for motor traffic.

685 (13 per cent) considered the proposals would increase motor traffic congestion, with the following sub-sets of respondents naming a road or area where they felt this would occur:

- 405 (8 per cent) respondents were concerned the proposals will increase congestion in general
- 109 (2 per cent) said Chiswick High Road
- 22 (<1 per cent) said from rat running in general
- 15 (<1 per cent) said King Street
- 14 (<1 per cent) said Chiswick roundabout
- 12 (<1 per cent) said Hammersmith Road
- 11 (<1 per cent) said Hammersmith Gyratory
- 10 (<1 per cent) said Stile Hall Gardens
- 10 (<1 per cent) said Kew Bridge
- 9 (<1 per cent) said Hammersmith Broadway
- 9 (<1 per cent) said Kew Bridge Junction
- 8 (<1 per cent) said Duke's Avenue/ Duke Road
- 6 (<1 per cent) were concerned about the interaction/congestion with South Circular Road traffic
- 5 (<1 per cent) said along the A4
- 4 (<1 per cent) said around Olympia events
- 4 (<1 per cent) said Bath Road
- 4 (<1 per cent) said Devonshire Road
- 4 (<1 per cent) said Goldhawk Road
- 4 (<1 per cent) said Wellesley Road
- 3 (<1 per cent) said Stile Hall Gardens
- 3 (<1 per cent) said Turnham Green

131 (2 per cent) respondents expressed concern on the current levels of congestion, including:

- 64 (1 per cent) respondents were concerned in general over current levels of congestion
- 41 (<1 per cent) said Chiswick High Road
- 8 (<1 per cent) said Hammersmith Gyratory
- 7 (<1 per cent) said King Street
- 5 (<1 per cent) said Chiswick Roundabout

45 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported the scheme as it would reduce congestion.
Other comments made about congestion, included:

- 17 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned the proposals would impact motorists all day long while cyclists would only use the cycle lanes in peak times
- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned the proposals will not help to reduce traffic volumes
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned that the proposals will reduce resilience of roads
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned that the Brentford FC development will increase local congestion
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said that conditions for motorists should be improved

**Road layout and parking**

136 (2 per cent) respondents commented on implications for road layout and parking, including:

- 45 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at the removal of traffic lanes and/or the decrease in road capacity
- 27 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at the loss of residents’ car parking spaces or parking in general
- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the relocation of the taxi rank in Avonmore Road (5 of these expressing concern the rank would be relocated next to two schools)
- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the safety of turning into/out of Chiswick High Road
- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested traffic calming measures to reduce speed
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about cars parking on the cycle infrastructure
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the loss of car parking at Chiswick High Road
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that parking restrictions should be more strictly enforced
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they opposed the scheme due to road closures
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the loss of car parking at British Grove
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested relocating the taxi rank to outside the station entrance
Journey times

59 (1 per cent) respondents commented on the implications for journey times, including:

- 51 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would increase journey times for motorists in general
- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that proposals will increase journey times for motorists around Chiswick High Road

Access and through traffic

84 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the implications for access, including:

- 32 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over plans to restrict access to British Grove
- 19 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned traffic would be pushed down residential roads
- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about restricting access to minor roads
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the proposals as they would reduce through traffic at Stile Hall Gardens
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the proposals as they would reduce through traffic in Chiswick
- 3 people (<1 per cent) respondents supported the proposals as they would reduce through traffic in general

Emergency services

37 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over possible delays for emergency services from the proposals.

Crossing the cycle track

26 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on difficulties crossing a two-way cycle track, including:

- 15 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the difficulty in general
- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the difficulty in crossing at Chiswick High Road

Demand management

22 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on demand management of vehicles, including:

- 15 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested demand management measures should be introduced to reduce motor traffic
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested demand management measures specifically for vehicles looking to avoid the A4

Cycle infrastructure

1,210 (22 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to cycle infrastructure. These comments have been divided into the following categories: route of track, segregation, track, suggested links, reallocation of road space, current conditions, priority, signage and markings, cycle parking, signals, other.

Route of track

446 (8 per cent) respondents commented on the route of the track, including:

- 361 (7 per cent) respondents suggested that a better alternative route would be along the A4
- 18 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested an alternative route alongside the riverside
- 18 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested an alternative route to Chiswick High Road
- 11 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cyclists use existing bus lanes
- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested alternative routes in general
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were opposed to the plans to route the track through Watermans Park
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested extending the route to connect to local services
- 3 (<1 per cent) suggested use of back streets and blue signs for cyclists

Segregation

292 (5 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to segregation, including:

- 151 (3 per cent) respondents supported segregated cycle lanes
- 97 (2 per cent) respondents said they would wish to see the whole route segregated
- 20 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed segregated cycle lanes
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they considered some parking spaces should be removed to allow for segregated lanes
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they opposed the use of shared space
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at the lack of segregation at Wellesley Road
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the shared use of bus/cycle lanes
Track

170 (3 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to the cycle track, including:

- 62 (1 per cent) respondents suggested maximising the width of the cycle track width, including ensuring it is wide enough for overtaking and to avoid congestion
- 46 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the use of flow tracks rather than two way cycle tracks
- 43 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about two way cycle tracks
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested contra-flow cycling, 3 of these suggested Prebend Gardens
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the use of semi-segregated flow lanes rather than two way track
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested minimising switching of tracks from north to south sides
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that two way track would be unsuitable for local journeys

Suggested links

86 (2 per cent) respondents suggested additional links for the scheme, including:

- 34 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested extending the proposed route to the east to connect with the Hyde Park cycle lane
- 16 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested good links to Quietway routes
- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested improved links to destinations along route e.g. schools, stations, points of interest
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested connecting the proposed route with Russell Road /Olympia Overground station
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested linking CS9 to Hammersmith Bridge
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested linking with the segregated cycle tracks on the A4
- 3 (<1 per cent) suggested a cycle lane to avoid Hammersmith Gyratory

Reallocation of road space

64 (1 per cent) respondents commented on issues related to the reallocation of road space, including:

- 29 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the reallocation of road space over pavements for cycle tracks
- 12 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the reallocation of road space
• 12 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the reallocation of road space over pavements for cycle tracks at Chiswick High Road
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents supported more space for cycling
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested infrastructure which would allow for different road usage

**Current conditions**
31 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the roads and pavements were too narrow for the proposals.

**Priority**
25 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating the priority cyclists should have, including:
  - 17 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested there should be clear cyclist priority across side roads
  - 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggest priority for cyclists at traffic lights
  - 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cyclist priority at peak hours

**Signage and markings**
7 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the issues relating to the signage and marking including:
  - 4 (<1 per cent) respondents considered the quantity of signs can be confusing
  - 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggest that the Cycle Superhighway is clearly marked on road surface

**Cycle parking**
10 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to cycle parking including:
  - 8 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested there should be an increase in cycle parking provision

**Signals**
10 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to signals, including:
  - 9 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested minimising disruption of signals on cyclist flow

**Other comments**
There were 32 other comments under this section and included: suggest bus stop bypasses with segregated cycle lanes (7 respondents), concerns that tracks will not be swept regularly (5), concern that blue paint becomes slippery when wet (3)
concern that lack of track segregation will cause conflict (3), concern that the scheme does not adhere to TfL’s London Cycling Design Standards (3).

Impacts on cyclists
828 (15 per cent) respondents commented on impacts on cyclists. These comments have been divided into the following categories: safety, current conditions, conflict, segregation, minor roads, and journey times.

Safety
392 (7 per cent) respondents commented on the issues relating to safety, including:

- 273 (5 per cent) respondents supported the scheme as it will make cycling safer and/or they support increasing cycling safety
- 62 (1 per cent) respondents supported segregated tracks making the route suitable for vulnerable groups, people of all ages and abilities
- 39 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support the use of segregated cycle tracks to improve cyclist safety
- 22 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned about safety of cyclists
- 29 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over safety where cycle tracks pass minor roads, including Russell Road (2), Kew Bridge (2), High Street Kensington (1) and Olympia (1)
- 22 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned about safety of cyclists
- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned that two-way track makes cycling conditions more dangerous
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned that proposals will not improve cyclist safety
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned that Cycle Superhighways create a false sense of safety

Current conditions
215 (5 per cent) respondents stated that they consider the current route to be unsafe/unpleasant to use. 137 were general concerns. Specific concerns about the current route being unsafe/unpleasant to use were raised at Hammersmith Gyratory (19), Chiswick High Road (16), Kew Bridge (12), Hammersmith Road (11), King Street East (4). Other comments included:

- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned Cycle Superhighways are dangerous for cyclists
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that lorries and buses make cycling unsafe and unpleasant
Conflict
63 (1 per cent) respondents were concerned the proposals would cause conflict, including:

- 26 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over cyclist/motorist conflict
- 22 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about vehicles crossing the two-way track
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned pedestrians will use cycle tracks as an extension of the pavement
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about cyclist safety at bus stop and loading bay bypasses

Segregation
9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that unsegregated sections will leave unexperienced cyclists vulnerable (6) or will discourage cyclists using the whole route (3).

Minor roads
8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported further restrictions on entry/exit to minor roads to improve cyclist safety.

Journey times
7 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on journey times for cyclists. 5 considered these would reduce and 2 considered they would increase.

Environmental Impacts
724 (13 per cent) respondents commented on impacts on the environment. These comments have been divided into the following categories: air quality and pollution, greening infrastructure, aesthetics, noise.

Air quality and pollution
564 (10 per cent) respondents raised issues about air quality and pollution, including:

- 286 (5 per cent) respondents stated they were concerned that pollution would increase as a result of congestion. Specific concerns were raised about Chiswick High Road (26), and Chiswick roundabout (4)
- 196 (4 per cent) respondents stated they supported the scheme due to air quality benefits
- 76 (1 per cent) respondents stated they were concerned at current levels of air pollution. Specific concerns were raised about Chiswick (11), Stile Hall Gardens (8) and Hammersmith Gyratory (3)
Green infrastructure
124 (2 per cent) respondents raised issues about greening, including:

- 103 (2 per cent) respondents said they were opposed to plans to remove trees
- 16 (<1 per cent) suggest planting of new trees to enhance the urban realm
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the proposals will cause damage to trees

Aesthetics
30 (<1 per cent) respondents raised issues about the aesthetics of the area, including:

- 26 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme will damage the aesthetics of the area, 19 of these mentioning Chiswick High Road
- 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported the scheme as it would improve the aesthetics of the area

Noise
4 (<1 per cent) respondents stated they supported the proposals as they would lead to noise reduction.

Economic Impacts
667 (12 per cent) respondents commented on economic impacts. These comments have been divided into the following categories: business and economy, funding.

Business and economy
570 (11 per cent) respondents raised issues about the impact on businesses and the local economy, including:

- 183 (3 per cent) respondents said were concerned about that the scheme would damage the local economy and/or local shops and businesses. 52 respondents specifically mentioned Chiswick High Road
- 150 (3 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over loss of street/café culture
- 41 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned businesses will be affected by restricted delivery and servicing access
- 29 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned a loss of footfall will affect businesses
- 23 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned a loss of parking will affect businesses
• 20 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the scheme as it would benefit shops and have a positive impact on the local economy
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested measures are taken to retain outdoor seating in pubs and cafes
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned increased journey times will affect businesses

**Funding**
199 (4 per cent) respondents raised issues about the funding of the scheme, including:

• 165 (3 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over costs of scheme
• 17 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme will waste money
• 16 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the costs of scheme should be met by cyclists

**Cyclist behaviour**
603 (11 per cent) respondents commented on cyclist behaviour. These comments have been divided into the following categories: compliance, attitude and speed.

**Compliance**
295 (5 per cent) respondents raised compliance issues, including:

• 103 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cyclists do not obey traffic lights
• 87 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cyclists disregard the highway code, including not using lights at night (9)
• 75 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cyclists will not use the cycle tracks
• 31 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned cyclists cycle on pavements

**Attitude**
147 (3 per cent) respondents raised issues about cycling attitude including:

• 54 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about aggressive cycling
• 50 (<1 per cent) respondents said cyclists have no regard for pedestrians
• 43 (<1 percent respondents said they were concerned over lack of cyclist awareness towards other road users
Speed
155 (3 per cent) respondents raised issues about the speed of cyclists, including:

- 99 (2 per cent) respondents were concerned over speeding cyclists
- 36 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned speeding cyclists pose a danger to other cyclists
- 20 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested a cyclist speed limit or physical measures to reduce cyclist speeds (including measures at Chiswick High Road 3)

Scope of scheme
340 (6 per cent) respondents made suggestions for the scheme to be extended to other areas of London. These suggestions included to Kensington and Chelsea (129), Heathrow (67) and to the East-West Cycle Superhighway (56).

Impact on bus users
379 (7 per cent) respondents raised issues about the impact on bus users. These comments have been divided into the following categories: bus stops, journey times and congestion, bus lanes, bus services.

Bus stops
117 (2 per cent) respondents raised issues about bus stops, including:

- 45 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the changes and/or access to bus stops
- 39 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned or opposed to floating bus stops as they were dangerous/ or unpleasant to use
- 18 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned about the impact of changes to bus stops on elderly and disabled people
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned at the loss of bus stops and/or space being taken away from pedestrians at bus stops

Journey times and congestion
94 (2 per cent) respondents were concerned about increased journey times and delays to bus services.

Bus lanes
89 (2 per cent) respondents raised issues about bus lanes, including:

- 77 (1 per cent) respondents said they opposed the removal of bus lanes
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested longer lane operating hours, including 24 hour operation (3)
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested an addition of bus lanes

**Bus services**

78 (1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on bus services in general, including 71 respondents who said they were concerned the proposals would negatively impact bus users.

**Junctions**

361 (7 per cent) respondents raised issues about junctions. These comments have been divided into the following categories: access, crossings, congestion, cyclist priority, safety, signals.

**Access**

222 (4 per cent) respondents raised issues about access at junctions, including:

- 67 (1 per cent) respondents said they opposed restricting access to the South Circular from Wellessey Road
- 42 (<1 per cent) respondents said they opposed restricting access to South Circular from Stile Hall Gardens
- 26 (<1 per cent) respondents said they opposed changing Duke’s Avenue to one way/entry only
- 25 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported restricting access to South Circular from Stile Hall Gardens
- 23 (<1 per cent) respondents said they opposed changing Duke Road to one way/exit only
- 12 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported restricting access to South Circular from Wellesley Road
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about access and safety at Chiswick roundabout
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they opposed preventing right turn into Heathfield Terrace from Chiswick High Road
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned one-way system will restrict access to the Glebe Estate
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned over access to Linden Gardens

**Crossings**

34 (<1 per cent) respondents raised issues about crossings, including:

- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they opposed removal of zebra crossing, 11 specifically mentioning at Chiswick High Road
- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested more consideration be given to crossings in general
6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they opposed the new signalised crossing at Kew Bridge Road

**Congestion**

30 (<1 per cent) respondents raised issues about congestion and junctions. 21 respondents specifically mentioned gridlock at the Hammersmith Gyratory.

**Cyclist priority**

19 (<1 per cent) respondents raised issues about cyclist priority at junctions. 17 specifically suggested cyclist priority at junctions and/or time separated time/space separated junctions.

**Safety**

16 (<1 per cent) respondents raised issues about safety at junctions, including:

- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over dangerous traffic and/or potential left hook risk on Lionel Road South
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about cyclist protection at junctions

**Signals**

8 (<1 per cent) respondents raised issues about signals. 4 respondents specifically considered there were too many traffic lights.

**Impact on churches**

226 (4 per cent) respondents raised issues about Our Lady Grace & St Edward’s church, including:

- 134 (2 per cent) respondents were concerned on the impact of narrowing pavement on religious events, and/or limited access to the church across CS9
- 47 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the cycle lane in front of the church and/or considered that the religious community and their ability to worship will negatively impacted
- 29 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned about pedestrian cyclist conflict
- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the cycle track is diverted around the church instead of on the pavement in front

**Safety**

215 (4 per cent) respondents raised issues about safety in general, including:

- 60 (1 per cent) respondents said they supported safer cycling infrastructure in London
• 57 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over safety at Chiswick High Road
• 51 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned proposals will decrease safety for all road users
• 25 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported the proposals due to safety benefits for all road users
• 12 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that Cycle Superhighways cause frustration to all road users
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested making roads safer for cycling rather than building new infrastructure

Policy
193 (3 per cent) respondents raised policy issues, including:

• 52 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cyclists are licenced (32), or registered (20)
• 32 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cyclists should be insured
• 30 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested new legislation to ensure cyclists follow highway code (19), or take a test (11)
• 25 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that Kensington and Chelsea do not support cycling
• 25 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cyclists should be taxed to pay for infrastructure
• 18 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested it should be compulsory for cyclists to use cycle lanes where available
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested bells be mandatory

Complementary measures
91 (2 per cent) respondents raised issues about complementary measures including:

• 52 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested improved education and training, including for cyclists (42) and motorists (9)
• 14 (<1 per cent) respondents raised issues about demand management including discouraging private car use (10)
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested measures to take the most polluting vehicles off the road
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested traffic is limited to 20 mph
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested reducing the cost of public transport

Construction impacts
57 (1 per cent) respondents raised issues about construction impacts, including:
• 44 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over disruption during construction
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned businesses will be adversely affected during construction
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over cyclist safety during construction

Impacts on schools

56 (1 per cent) respondents raised issues about the impact on schools, including:

• 26 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about student/cyclist conflict or that the proposals would be dangerous outside of schools
• 17 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the proposals as they considered they would provide safe routes to schools
Section A: Hammersmith Road (between Holland Road and Rowan Road)

(Q3. “Do you have any comments on the proposals for Hammersmith Road?”)

1,125 of the 5,388 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Hammersmith Road, between Holland Road and Rowan Road. Percentages are calculated from the overall number of respondents and where above one per cent have been rounded. Only comments that occurred more then twice are included.

General comments are presented first. Other comments have been grouped into the categories below listed in order of how frequently they were mentioned (insert hyperlinks)

**General**

Impact on motorists

Cycle infrastructure

Principles of the scheme

Junctions

Impact on cyclists

Impact on bus users

Impact on pedestrians

Environmental impacts

Cyclist behaviour

Scope of scheme

Economic impacts

Policy

Complementary measures

Impact on residents

Construction impacts

Impact on schools

Safety

Impact on churches
General

198 (4 per cent) respondents made general comments on the proposals for Hammersmith Road.

- 99 (2 per cent) respondents made a general comment in support of the scheme
- 42 (<1 per cent) respondents made a general comment opposing the scheme
- 30 (<1 per cent) respondents commented about other sections of the proposed route
- 17 (<1 per cent) respondents made comments out of the scope of the project

Impact on motorists

381 (7 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Hammersmith Road to affect motorists. These comments have been divided into the following categories: congestion, taxis, journey times, parking, emergency services, signals.

**Congestion**

290 (5 per cent) respondents commented on congestion issues at Hammersmith Road, including:

- 96 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that CS9 would worsen existing congestion in the area
- 78 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over current levels of congestion in the area
- 57 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned removal of traffic lanes or reallocation of road space would increase congestion
- 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over current levels of congestion at Olympia
- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would lead to increased traffic congestion from rat running
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said that were concerned the proposals would increase congestion in the Olympia area
- 8 (<1 per cent) of respondents said they were concerned that traffic lanes are already too narrow
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said that they were concerned the proposals would increase congestion at Hammersmith Gyratory
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over current levels of congestion in Avonmore Road
Taxis
34 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on taxi issues from the proposals for Hammersmith Road, including:

- 23 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the relocation of the taxi rank in Avonmore Road
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the taxi rank at Olympia should be moved to a position visible from the venue

Journey times
23 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the proposals for Hammersmith Road would increase journey times for motorists.

Parking
14 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on parking issues from the proposals at Hammersmith Road, including:

- 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were opposed to the loss of parking

Emergency access
5 (<1 per cent) respondents said that they were concerned about emergency vehicle access at Hammersmith Road

Signals
4 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to signals at Hammersmith Road, including:

- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested lights are phased to promote better traffic flow

Cycle infrastructure
246 (5 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to the proposals for cycle infrastructure at Hammersmith Road. These comments have been divided into the following categories: segregation, two way cycle track, route alignment, priority and signals.

Segregation
113 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the segregation of the proposed cycle track at Hammersmith Road, including:

- 36 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the whole route should be separated without interruptions
- 32 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported segregated cycle lanes
• 17 (<1 per cent) respondents concerned about sharing space with buses in bus lanes
• 12 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the Kensington High Street should be segregated and/or opposed shared bus and cycle lanes there
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they opposed segregated cycle lanes
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported shared bus and cycle lanes

Two way cycle tracks
47 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues about the proposed track at Hammersmith Road, including:

• 18 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested use of with flow tracks over two way route
• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested maximising cycle track widths
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported two-way track (general)
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they had concerns about the practicalities of two-way tracks
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about two-way track switch

Route alignment
46 (<1 per cent) of respondents commented on issues relating to the route of track at Hammersmith Road, including:

• 17 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested there should be an alternative route along the A4
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested using less busy roads, 3 of these suggested alternative routes by the riverside
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested contra-flow cycling at Olympia Way
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested extending the route to connect to local services

Priority and signals
16 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues about priority and signals from the proposals at Hammersmith Road including:

• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested clear cyclist priority over side roads
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents supported cycle tracks that give cyclists priority
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cycle priority signals
Principles of the scheme

193 (4 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to the principles of the scheme at Hammersmith Road. These comments have been divided into the following categories: prioritisation of modes, uptake of cycling, cycle network, Cycle Superhighways, public transport, new developments and location.

Prioritisation of modes

91 (2 per cent) respondents commented on issues about the prioritisation of modes at Hammersmith Road including:

- 33 (<1 per cent) respondents said they opposed the scheme, and that changes are not needed to accommodate cyclists
- 12 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned that there is insufficient space for all road users
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned that the scheme is anti-motorist
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they opposed prioritising cyclists
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the scheme does not benefit motorists or pedestrians
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported prioritising active travel over cars

Uptake of cycling

39 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues about the uptake of cycling at Hammersmith Road, including:

- 20 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported the scheme as it will encourage cycling uptake
- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned cycle tracks would be underused
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned other similar schemes have not made a difference

Cycle network

33 (<1 percent) respondents said they were concerned that the scheme does not connect to the cycle network.

Cycle Superhighways

12 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues about Cycle Superhighways at Hammersmith Road, including:

- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that other Cycle Superhighway areas are worse than before
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that lessons learned from earlier Cycle Superhighways are incorporated into designs
Public transport
7 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that public transport should be improved, including 3 respondents who suggested that the weekday underground service to Olympia is reinstated

New developments
5 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned that new building developments have not been considered in the scheme.

Location
3 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned that the scheme is in the wrong location.

Junctions
105 (2 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to junctions at Hammersmith Road, including subsets of respondents naming a road or area:

- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned about cyclist access at North End Road
- 7 (<1 per cent) concerned about the junction at Holland Road
- 7 (<1 per cent) concerned about congestion at the North End Road junction
- 6 (<1 per cent) concerned at the no option to turn right eastbound at the Edith Road junction (3) or over congestion at the junction (3)
- 4 (<1 per cent) concerned over access to the junction at Avonmore Road
- 3 (<1 per cent) concerned about the junction at Blythe Road
- 3 (<1 per cent) concerned at a bottle neck at Olympia Way
- 3 (<1 per cent) concerned about the advanced stop line at Holland Road
- 3 (<1 per cent) suggested that more consideration be given to junction crossings in general

Impact on cyclists
96 (2 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to the impact on cyclists at Hammersmith Road. These comments have been divided into the following categories: safety, conflict, current conditions and minor roads.

Safety
37 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on safety impacts on cyclists at Hammersmith Road, including:

- 21 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the use of segregated cycle lanes to improve cyclist safety
- 6 (<1 per cent) supported the scheme as it will make cycling safer
• 3 (<1 per cent) were concerned about the safety of cyclists on Kensington High Street

Conflict
25 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues of potential conflict for cyclists at Hammersmith Road, including:

• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned over cyclist/bus conflict at bus stops
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned about vehicles crossing the two-way track
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned that pedestrians will use cycle tracks as an extension of the pavement

Current conditions
23 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the current route is unsafe/unpleasant to use.

Minor roads
6 (<1 per cent) respondents stated that they support further restrictions on entry/exit to minor roads to improve cyclist safety.

Impact on bus users
95 (2 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to the impact on bus users at Hammersmith Road. These comments have been divided into the following categories: bus lanes, journey times, bus stops and congestion.

Bus lanes
29 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to bus lanes at Hammersmith Road, including:

• 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they opposed removal of bus lanes
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about combining normal traffic lanes and bus lanes.
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported the introduction of 24 hour bus lanes

Journey times
28 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would increase bus journey times.
Bus stops
24 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to bus stops at Hammersmith Road, including:

- 16 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about bus stops, opposed the relocation of bus stops or opposed floating bus stops/bus stop bypasses
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported floating bus stops/bus stop bypasses

Congestion
11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about increasing congestion around the bus station.

Impact on pedestrians
88 (2 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to the impacts on pedestrians at Hammersmith Road. These comments have been divided into the following categories: congestion, vulnerable groups, safety, and crossings.

Congestion
34 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to congestion including:

- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the reduction of walking space
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would increase pedestrian congestion
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about current pedestrian congestion
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that pavement areas should be increased

Vulnerable groups
20 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the proposals for Hammersmith Road on children, elderly and disabled people.

Safety
15 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about pedestrian safety in general

Crossings
15 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on crossings including three respondents who suggested pedestrians should have priority at side roads.
Environmental impacts

86 (2 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to environmental impacts of the proposals at Hammersmith Road.

74 (1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to air quality and pollution, including:

- 50 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would make air quality worse
- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over current levels of air pollution
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported the scheme due to air quality benefits
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that pollution would increase due to stationary traffic

Cyclist behaviour

62 (1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to cyclist behaviour, including:

- 19 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned over speeding cyclists
- 17 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned cyclists do not have concern for pedestrians
- 15 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned that cyclists disregard the highway code
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned that cyclists would not use the cycle tracks

Scope of the scheme

49 (<1 per cent) respondents made suggestions about the scope of the scheme, including:

- 26 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the scheme should be extended to Kensington/Chelsea/Kings Road
- 16 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the scheme should connect to CS3
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the scheme should be extended to Hounslow and Heathrow
Economic impacts
41 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the economic impacts of the proposals for Hammersmith Road, including:

- 19 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over the costs of the scheme
- 18 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned businesses would be affected by the proposals (17 of these were negative impacts including 8 respondents mentioning restricted delivery and servicing)

Policy
29 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested possible new policies, including:

- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cycling legislation is updated to provide better protection to pedestrians
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cyclists should be registered
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cyclists should be insured

Complementary measures
22 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested possible complementary measures, including:

- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested improved education and training for cyclists (4), motorists (3) and pedestrians (3)
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested traffic calming measures such as 20 mph limits

Impact on residents
21 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact of the proposals on residents at Hammersmith Road including:

- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned Cycle Superhighways negatively impact residents who live near them
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned residents would not benefit from the proposals

Construction impacts
11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about disruption during the construction of the scheme.
Impact on schools

13 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact of the proposals on schools including 8 respondents who considered the proposals were dangerous to children.

Safety

11 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on general safety implications including:

- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned proposals will decrease safety for all road users
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested making roads safer for cycling rather than building new infrastructure
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the proposals due to safety benefits for all road users

Impact on churches

6 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned about conflicts between users around churches including 5 concerned about conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists.
Section B: Hammersmith Gyratory (between Rowan Road and King Street east)

Question 4 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for Hammersmith Gyratory?”

983 of the 5,388 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Hammersmith Gyratory. Percentages are calculated from the overall number of respondents and where above one per cent have been rounded. Only comments that occurred more than twice are included.

General comments are presented first. Other comments have been grouped into the categories below listed in order of how frequently they were mentioned (insert hyperlinks)

General

Impact on motorists
Impact on cyclists
Cycle infrastructure
Impact on pedestrians
Principles of the scheme
Scope of scheme
Safety
Junctions
Environmental impacts
Impact on bus users
Economic impacts
Cyclist behaviour
Complementary measures
Policy
Construction impacts
General

There were 242 general comments about the overall proposals for Hammersmith Gyratory:

- 146 (<3 per cent) respondents made a general comment in support of the scheme such as “great”. 86 specifically mentioned Hammersmith Gyratory
- 39 (<1 per cent) respondents made a general comment opposing the scheme such as “bad idea”
- 50 (<1 per cent) respondents made comments out of scope of the project
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents commented about other sections of the route

Impact on motorists

305 (6 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on motorists. These comments have been divided into the following categories: congestion and road layout. Only comments that occurred more than twice are included in this section.

Congestion

228 (4 per cent) respondents commented on congestion issues from the proposals at Hammersmith Gyratory, including:

- 123 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would increase congestion
- 67 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about current levels of congestion
- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would slow traffic speeds
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over possible delays for emergency vehicles from the proposals
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the scheme as it would reduce congestion
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would increase congestion on the A4
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over a lack of plans to manage traffic demand when the A4 is congested.

Road layout

61 (1 per cent) respondents commented on road layout issues from the proposals at Hammersmith Gyratory, including:

- 42 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at the removal of traffic lanes
- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the current road layout needs improving
Impacts on cyclists

229 (4 per cent) respondents commented on the impacts on cyclists, including:

- 130 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the current route is unsafe and unpleasant to use
- 62 (1 per cent) respondents supported the scheme because it will make cycling safer
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents supported segregated cycling tracks as they would improve cyclist safety
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the scheme as it would make cycling more dangerous
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned short green signals would encourage cyclists to use general traffic lanes and jump red signals at the Cycle Superhighway
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over conflict between cyclists and motorists
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme would make cycling in the area more complicated

Cycle infrastructure

193 (4 per cent) respondents commented on the issues relating to cycle infrastructure for the proposals for Hammersmith Gyratory. These comments have been divided into the following categories: route of track, signals, track, segregation and current conditions.

Route of track

64 (1 per cent) respondents commented on the route of the track at Hammersmith Gyratory, including:

- 21 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested an alternative route along the A4
- 18 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cyclists should use alternative routes to bypass the Gyratory
- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested other links for the route
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about bends on the track at King Street/Gyratory
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the track runs south under the flyover
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested elevating the Cycle Superhighway above the road
Signals
39 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on signals, and 38 of these were comments about light sequencing with concerns that cyclists might be delayed and suggestions that sequencing ensures minimal delays to cyclists.

Track
34 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the proposed track, including:

- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over two way cycle tracks
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about ramps
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the difficulty joining/leaving the track at Hammersmith Bridge/Black’s Road
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested maximising cycle track widths
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested constructing with flow over two way cycle tracks
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested reallocation of road space over pavements for cycle tracks
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the Cycle Superhighway should have smooth and level surfaces

Segregation
32 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the segregation of the track, including 26 people supporting the segregation at the Gyratory.

Current conditions
9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they considered that current cycling conditions are unsatisfactory.

Impact on pedestrians
99 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on pedestrians. These comments have been divided into the following categories: safety, crossings, current conditions and other issues.

Safety
52 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on safety issues from the proposals at Hammersmith Gyratory, including:
• 19 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would make the area less safe for pedestrians
• 12 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about conflict between pedestrians and cyclists
• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the impact on vulnerable groups, including disabled people (5) and elderly people (4)
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the proposals as they will improve pedestrian safety

Crossings
20 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on crossings, including:
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would make it more difficult to cross the road
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested minimising waiting times and maximising crossing times for pedestrians

Current conditions
9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the current pedestrian environment is unsafe/unpleasant to use.

Other issues
18 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on other issues, including:
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the reduction of walking space
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme would negatively impact pedestrians

Principles of the scheme
91 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the principles of the scheme. These comments have been divided into the following categories: uptake of cycling, prioritisation of modes and cycle network.

Uptake of cycling
43 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the uptake of cycling, including:
• 18 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported the scheme as it would encourage cycling uptake
• 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned cycle tracks will be underused
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned cyclists would still use the road and pavements
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cycling is not a viable alternative for everyone

Prioritisation of modes
30 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on prioritisation of modes, including:

• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the scheme, considering that changes are not needed to accommodate cyclists
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed prioritising cyclists
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents supported prioritising active travel over cars
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they considered the scheme to be anti-motorist
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said public transport should be improved instead

Cycle network
15 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the cycle network, including:

• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme does not connect to the cycle network
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that other Cycle Superhighway areas are worse than before
• 3 < 1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the cycle track does not need to run to Black’s Road

Scope of the scheme
71 (1 per cent) respondents commented on the scope of the scheme, including:

• 51 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested adding further cycle tracks to improve north/south links from the gyratory
• 12 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested new routes
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested a gyratory bypass to Fulham
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested improving the gyratory for all road users
Safety
67 (1 per cent) respondents commented on the scope of the scheme, including:

- 31 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the proposals due to safety benefits for all road users
- 23 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the current gyratory layout is dangerous to all road users
- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would decrease safety for all road users

Junctions
48 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the proposed junctions at Hammersmith Gyratory. These comments have been divided into the following categories: road layout, cyclist priority and access.

Road layout
27 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the proposals for the road layout including:

- 11 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested an underpass
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested removing the gyratory
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the proposed junction at Beadon Road

Cyclist priority
7 (<1 per cent) respondents supported time/ space separated junctions.

Access
6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at access to or from Shepherds Bush Road for westbound CS9 cyclists.

Environmental impacts
46 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the scope of the scheme, including:

- 33 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned pollution would increase because of congestion
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the scheme due to air quality benefits
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about current levels of pollution
Impact on bus users
37 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impacts for bus users of the proposals, including:

- 31 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would result in delays to bus services at the gyratory
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the removal of bus lanes

Economic impacts
27 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the economic impacts of the scheme, including:

- 16 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over the costs of the scheme or suggested the money should be spent elsewhere
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the congestion would negatively impact the economy

Cyclist behaviour
26 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on cyclist behaviour, including:

- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned cyclists do not obey traffic signals
- 7 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned cyclists cycle on pavements
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cyclists speed (3) or cause accidents (3).
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cyclists will not use the proposed cycle tracks

Complementary measures
25 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on complementary measures, including:

- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested improved education and training, 3 of which mentioned motorists
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested traffic calming measures
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested there should be further complementary measures to reduce congestion
Policy
11 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested there should be new policies around cycling, including legislation to be updated to give better protection to pedestrians (4) and insurance (3).

Construction impacts
6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at the disruption which would be caused through the construction of the scheme.
Section C: Beadon Road

(Question 5 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for Beadon Road ”)

515 of the 5,388 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Beadon Road. Percentages are calculated from the overall number of respondents and where above one per cent have been rounded. Only comments that occurred more then twice are included.

General comments are presented first. Other comments have been grouped into the categories below listed in order of how frequently they were mentioned (insert hyperlinks)

General
Impact on motorists
Junctions
Cycle infrastructure
Principles of the scheme
Impact on bus users
Environmental impacts
Impact on pedestrians
Impact on cyclists
Complementary measures
Cyclist behaviour
Economic impacts
Policy
Safety
General

There were 104 general comments about the proposals for Beadon Road:

- 46 (<1 per cent) respondents made a general comment in support of the scheme such as “great”
- 24 (<1 per cent) respondents made a general comment opposing the scheme such as “bad idea”
- 22 (<1 per cent) respondents made comments out of the scope of the project
- 11 (<1 per cent) respondents commented about other sections of the proposed route

Impact on motorists

133 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the impacts on motorists in the area. These comments have been divided into the following categories: congestion, road layout, signals and crossings.

Congestion

98 (2 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to congestion:

- 46 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would increase congestion, including Beadon Road (4), Hammersmith Grove (3)
- 40 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over current levels of congestion, including Beadon Road (5), Beadon Road/Hammersmith Grove junction (4), Hammersmith Grove (3)

Road layout

11 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the road layout, including 7 who said they were concerned at the removal of traffic lanes which would decrease road capacity.

Signals

9 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on signals, including:

- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested lights are phased to promote better traffic flow
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that proposed signalling will increase congestion

Crossings

8 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on crossings, including 7 who were concerned that current zebra crossings would cause congestion.
Junctions

89 (2 per cent) respondents commented on junctions in the area. These comments have been divided into the following headings: crossings, road layout and signals.

Crossings

50 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on crossings, including

- 35 (<1 per cent) respondents supported signalised crossings on Beadon Road
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the new signalised crossing at Hammersmith Grove
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the removal of a zebra crossing which is needed to get to Hammersmith station

Road layout

22 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the road layout, including:

- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed narrowing at the Hammersmith Grove junction
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents supported narrowing at the Hammersmith Grove junction

Signals

13 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on signals, including:

- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the new signalised junction at Beadon Road will not improve traffic flow
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the signalised junction at Beadon Road as it would improve traffic flow
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned there were too many traffic lights at Beadon Road

Cycle infrastructure

82 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the proposed cycle infrastructure in the area. These comments have been divided into the following categories: segregation, route of track and bus stop.

Segregation

31 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues about segregation, including:

- 19 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the whole route should be segregated, including 5 mentioning Beadon Road
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that an “advisory” cycle lane in Beadon Road would be insufficient to protect/attract cyclists
5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cycle tracks stop at bus stops

Route of track
26 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the route of the track and suggested links. 11 respondents suggested an alternative route along the A4.

Bus stop
9 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested a bus stop bypass with a segregated cycle lane at Hammersmith station.

Principles of the scheme
51 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the principles of the scheme. These comments have been divided into: prioritisation of modes and uptake of the scheme.

Prioritisation of modes
27 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the prioritisation of modes, including:

- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the scheme, considering that changes are not needed to accommodate cyclists
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested prioritising public transport
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned there is insufficient space for all road users

Uptake of cycling
20 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the uptake of cycling, including:

- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cycle tracks will be ineffective in achieving mode shift
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the scheme as it will encourage cycling uptake
- 3 (<1 percent) respondents suggested reducing the priority of motorists to promote mode shift

Impact on bus users
41 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on bus users in the area, including:

- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals will increase bus journey times
- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the addition of bus lanes, 3 mentioning Glenthorne Road
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the removal of bus lanes and that this would increase bus journey times
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the current length of bus journeys
• 3(<1 per cent) respondents opposed the existing bus stop at Hammersmith Grove

Environmental impacts
30 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the environmental impacts in the area, including:

• 19 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the proposals would worsen air pollution
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over current levels of pollution
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the measures to reduce pollution at Beadon Road

Impact on pedestrians
26 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on pedestrians in the area, including:

• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the proposals makes the area at Hammersmith Grove less safe for pedestrians
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that vulnerable pedestrian groups have not been considered
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over current pedestrian congestion

Impact on cyclists
25 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on cyclists in the area, including:

• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the current cycling route is unsafe or unpleasant to use
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the entire route is segregated to ensure cyclist safety
Complementary measures
18 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on complementary measures, including 8 respondents who suggested improved education and training, including cyclists (5) and motorists (3)

Cyclist behaviour
18 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on cyclist behaviour, including:
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over speeding cyclists
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cyclists do not obey traffic lights

Economic impacts
15 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the economic impacts in the area, including 7 respondents who said they were concerned over the costs of the scheme.

Policy
10 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on policy issues, including:
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cyclists should be licenced
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cyclists should be insured

Safety
9 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on safety issues, including 4 who said they were concerned the proposals would decrease safety for all road users.
Section D: King Street East (between Hammersmith Gyratory and Leamore Street)

(Question 6 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for King Street (East)”)  

694 of the 5,388 respondents provided comments on the proposals for King Street (East). Percentages are calculated from the overall number of respondents and where above one per cent have been rounded. Only comments that occurred more then twice are included.

General comments are presented first. Other comments have been grouped into the categories below listed in order of how frequently they were mentioned (insert hyperlinks)

**General**

**Cycle infrastructure**

**Impact on pedestrians**

**Impact on motorists**

**Principles of the scheme**

**Impact on cyclists**

**Economic impacts**

**Cyclist behaviour**

**Impact on bus users**

**Environmental impacts**

**Complementary measures**

**Policy**

**Junctions**

**Safety**

**Scope of the scheme**

**Construction impacts**
General

There were 116 general comments about the proposals for King Street (East):

- 39 (<1 per cent) respondents made a general comment in support of the scheme such as “great”
- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents made a general comment opposing the scheme such as “bad idea”
- 54 (<1 per cent) respondents commented about other sections of the proposed route or made comments out of the scope of the project

Cycle infrastructure

225 (4 per cent) respondents commented on the proposed cycle infrastructure in the area. These comments have been divided into the following categories: route of track, current conditions, track, segregation, signals and signage.

Route of track

91 (2 per cent) respondents commented on issues about segregation, including:

- 31 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested an alternative route along the A4
- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the two-way track switch
- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that having two way tracks on one side of the road is confusing
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that segregated tracks should follow the traffic
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the proposals as an extension of the existing partial cycle routes
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested an alternative route alongside the riverside
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the cycle track being the opposite direction to traffic is dangerous in case drivers don’t look both ways when they pull out
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested other quiet roads would be more appropriate for this section of the route (Beavor Lane, Black Lion Lane Vencourt Place)

Current conditions

68 (1 per cent) respondents commented on issues about segregation, including:
• 27 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the road and pavement are too narrow for the proposals
• 20 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned current cycling conditions are unsatisfactory, 10 specifically mentioned King Street
• 15 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned existing facilities are not well used
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the current eastbound cycle track confuses drivers
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that vehicles currently park in the cycle tracks

Track
31 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues about the track, including:
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested maximising the width of cycle tracks to minimise crowding
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the use of with flow tracks over two way route
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cycle tracks which give cyclists priority at minor roads
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the reallocation of road space
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that narrow tracks can make it dangerous to overtake slower cyclists
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the track should have smooth and level surfaces

Segregation
12 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues about segregation, including 9 respondents who opposed segregated cycle tracks.

Signals
11 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues about signals, including 7 who suggested signals should be phased to minimise disruption to cyclist flow.

Signage
8 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues about signage, suggesting signs to legally enforce priority for cyclists.

Impact on pedestrians
189 (4 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on pedestrians in the area. These comments have been divided into: safety, pavements, impacts, crossings, signage and markings.

Safety
74 (1 per cent) respondents commented on issues about safety, including:

- 22 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the proposals would make the area less safe for pedestrians
- 20 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the proposals would increase pedestrian/cyclist conflict
- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that pedestrians could walk into cycle tracks without looking
- 12 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about pedestrian safety due to the numerous schools in the area
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the proposals which would improve pedestrian safety

Pavements
59 (1 per cent) respondents commented on issues about pavements, including:

- 21 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that pavements are already very narrow
- 15 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over the reduction of walking space
- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed narrowing the already congested footway on the north side of King Street (east of Lyric Square)
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested increasing the pavement area
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the street is pedestrianised

Impacts
30 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on impacts, including:

- 23 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme would negatively impact pedestrians
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the scheme as it will be beneficial for pedestrians

Crossings
17 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on crossings, including 11 who said they were concerned that the Superhighway would make it more difficult to cross the road.
**Signage and markings**

8 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on signage and markings, including 5 who suggested clear signage or signage to indicate who has the right of way between pedestrians and cyclists.

**Impact on motorists**

150 (3 per cent) respondents commented on the impacts on motorists in the area. These comments have been divided into the following categories: congestion and road layout.

**Congestion**

109 (2 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to congestion:

- 78 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would increase congestion, including removal of traffic lanes (14), reallocation of road space (12)
- 27 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over current levels of congestion
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned it is not clear how the proposed scheme would ease congestion

**Road layout**

34 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the road layout, including

- 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at the removal of traffic lanes
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals will create confusion for road users and/or the proposed layout is confusing/complicated
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about emergency vehicle access
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would limit the ability of traffic to exit Hammersmith Broadway/Kings Street
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the scheme as motorised traffic is already restricted to one lane

**Principles of the scheme**

88 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the principles of the scheme. These comments have been divided into: prioritisation of modes and other.

**Prioritisation of modes**

59 (1 per cent) respondents commented on the prioritisation of modes including:
• 22 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed prioritising cyclists, 3 mentioning over motorists
• 15 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the scheme, considering that changes are not needed to accommodate cyclists
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested prioritising public transport, 4 suggesting this should be environmentally friendly
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested pedestrians should be prioritised
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned there is insufficient space for all road users

Other
26 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on other issues, including
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cycle tracks will be underused
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme had not been properly thought out
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the health of residents, pedestrians and cyclists from congestion generated from the proposals

Impact on cyclists
72 (1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on cyclists in the area, including:
• 19 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the use of segregated cycle tracks to improve cyclist safety
• 12 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the scheme as it will make cycling safer
• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the current cycling route is unsafe or unpleasant to use
• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the safety of cyclists
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about conflict between cyclists and motorists
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents supported further restrictions on entry/exit to minor roads to improve cyclist safety

Economic impacts
47 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on economic impacts, including:
• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned businesses will be affected by restricted delivery and servicing access
• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme will damage the local economy
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that there will be a loss of footfall which will affect businesses
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme will be a waste of money
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the scheme as it will benefit high street shops
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they opposed spending more money on cyclists

Cyclist behaviour
44 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on cyclist behaviour, including:

• 16 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over speeding cyclists, are a danger to pedestrians
• 15 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals will encourage cyclists to speed or cycle in a dangerous manner
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned cyclists cycle on pavements

Impact on bus users
40 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on bus users in the area, including:

• 21 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals will increase bus journey times
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the removal of the bus lane and that this would cause bus delays
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned narrowing the carriageway will not allow buses to overtake vehicles parked in bus lanes
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the impact of the relocation of the bus stop on elderly and disabled people

Environmental impacts
35 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the environmental impacts in the area, including:
• 30 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the proposals would worsen air pollution
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the measures to reduce pollution

Complementary measures
23 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on complementary measures, including
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested additional tree planting as part of the scheme
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested removing street clutter to gain pavement space
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested policies to encourage walking

Policy
17 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on policy, including:
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cycling legislation is updated to give better protection to pedestrians
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cyclists should be insured

Junctions
16 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on junctions in the area, including
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested junctions are considered more carefully
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at cyclist safety at junctions
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over traffic light phasing

Safety
10 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on safety, including:
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that Cycle Superhighways will cause frustration to all road users
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals will decrease safety for all road users
Scope of scheme
8 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the scope of the scheme, including 5 respondents who suggested the scheme should be extended to Kensington/Chelsea/Kings Road.

Construction impacts
3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about disruption during construction.
Section E: King Street (West)

(Question 6 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for King Street (West)"

688 of the 5,388 respondents provided comments on the proposals for King Street (West). Percentages are calculated from the overall number of respondents and where above one per cent have been rounded. Only comments that occurred more then twice are included.

General comments are presented first. Other comments have been grouped into the categories below listed in order of how frequently they were mentioned (insert hyperlinks)

General
Impact on motorists
Cycle infrastructure
Impact on pedestrians
Impact on cyclists
Principles of the scheme
Junctions
Impact on bus users
Environmental impacts
Economic impacts
Cyclist behaviour
Safety
Impact on schools
Complementary measures
Impact on churches
Policy
Impact on residents
Construction impacts
General

There were 124 general comments about the proposals for King Street (West):

- 47 (<1 per cent) respondents made a general comment in support of the scheme such as “great”
- 44 (<1 per cent) respondents made a general comment opposing the scheme such as “bad idea”
- 23 (<1 per cent) respondents commented about other sections of the proposed route or made comments out of the scope of the project

Impact on motorists

190 (4 per cent) respondents commented on the impacts on motorists in the area. These comments have been divided into the following categories: congestion, road layout and other.

Congestion

129 (2 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to congestion, including:

- 83 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would increase congestion, including at Goldhawk Road (12), increased journey times for motorists in general (12)
- 32 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over current levels of congestion

Road layout

34 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the road layout, including

- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at the removal of traffic lanes
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned roads would not be wide enough for HGVs, including 4 respondents mentioning British Grove
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would limit the ability of traffic to exit roads

Other

27 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on other impacts on motorists, including:

- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned traffic would be pushed down residential roads around St Peters Square
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over proposals to restrict access to British Grove
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over parking restrictions at British Grove
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that relocated bus stops would block driver visibility

Cycle infrastructure
180 (3 per cent) respondents commented on the proposed cycle infrastructure in the area. These comments have been divided into the following categories: route of track, track, segregation and current conditions.

Route of track
99 (2 per cent) respondents commented on issues about the route of the track, including:
• 48 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested an alternative route along the A4
• 16 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the route switching between the north and south sides of the road
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the practicality of a two way track
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cycle tracks are routed on both sides of the road
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested an alternative route alongside the riverside
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that trees are too close to the cycle track at St Peters Square and Black Lion Lane

Track
50 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues about the track, including:
• 27 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the road and pavement are too narrow for the proposals, including 4 mentioning British Grove
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents supported more space for cycling
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested maximising the width of cycle tracks to minimise crowding
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that narrow tracks can make it dangerous to overtake slower cyclists
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about use of traffic lights to cross roads

Segregation
14 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues about segregation, including
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested putting physical barriers between cycles, cars and pedestrians to ensure safety
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about potential conflict between pedestrians and cyclists at bus stop bypasses
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed segregated cycle tracks

**Current conditions**

5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the current cycle lanes are too narrow.

**Impact on pedestrians**

116 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on pedestrians in the area. These comments have been divided into: safety, pavements and crossings.

**Safety**

64 (1 per cent) respondents commented on issues about safety, including:

• 37 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the proposals makes the area less safe for pedestrians
• 18 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that vulnerable pedestrian groups have not been considered
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that pedestrians could walk into cycle tracks without looking

**Pavements**

34 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues about pavements, including:

• 28 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over the reduction of walking space
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested increasing the pavement area

**Crossings**

5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested pedestrian priority at crossings.

**Impact on cyclists**

87 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on cyclists in the area. These comments have been divided into safety, conflict and other.

**Safety**

32 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on safety issues for cyclists, including:
• 14 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the scheme as it will make cycling safer
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the use of segregated cycle tracks to improve cyclist safety
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about where the proposed cycle tracks pass minor roads
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the scheme as they considered it would make cycling more dangerous in the area

Conflict
28 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on conflict issues, including:

• 19 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about vehicles crossing the two-way track
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about conflict between cyclists and motorists

Other
27 (<1 per cent) respondents made other comments, including:

• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the current route is unsafe/unpleasant to use
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme will make cycling in the area more complicated at Studland Street
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that there should be signage and markings making it obvious that cyclists crossing side roads have priority
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that cyclist safety is ensured at junctions and crossings

Principles of the scheme
79 (1 per cent) respondents commented on the principles of the scheme. These comments have been divided into: prioritisation of modes and uptake of cycling.

Prioritisation of modes
67 (1 per cent) respondents commented on the prioritisation of modes including:

• 24 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the scheme, considering that changes are not needed to accommodate cyclists
• 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme is not properly thought through
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed prioritising cyclists, 2 mentioning over motorists
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested pedestrians should be prioritised
6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested prioritising public transport, 3 suggesting this should be environmentally friendly
5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme encourages cyclist commuter through traffic but does not account for the needs of local cycle traffic
3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme should not be implemented at the expense of other modes
3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the scheme benefits all road users

Uptake of cycling

11 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the uptake of cycling, including
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cycle tracks will be underused
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the scheme as it will encourage cycling uptake

Junctions

66 (1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to junctions, including:
- 27 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned about the proposed access arrangements for British Grove
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested separate signal timing for cyclists
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at cyclist access at Nigel Playfair Avenue
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the junction at Studland Street/Nigel Playfair Avenue is dangerous
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested box markings on all junctions to prevent traffic blocking cycle tracks

Impact on bus users

58 (1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on bus users in the area, including:
- 27 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals will increase bus journey times
- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the removal of bus lanes
- 12 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over changes to bus stops
Environmental impacts

53 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the environmental impacts in the area, including:

- 33 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the proposals would worsen air pollution
- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the proposal for tree removal at St Peters Square
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned cycle tracks were aesthetically unpleasing

Economic impacts

47 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on economic impacts, including:

- 18 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the economic impacts on local shops and businesses, including 7 mentioning British Grove
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at the cost of the scheme
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over the loss of street/café culture
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about restricted delivery and servicing access
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme will be a waste of money

Cyclist behaviour

37 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on cyclist behaviour, including:

- 29 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over speeding cyclists, including 3 that speeding cyclists are a danger to other cyclists
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned cyclists would not use the cycle tracks

Safety

35 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on safety, including:

- 25 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals will decrease safety for all road users, including 7 mentioning British Grove, 3 Nigel Playfair Avenue, 3 Rivercourt Road
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would increase the number of accidents
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that Cycle Superhighways will cause frustration to all road users

Impact on schools
26 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the impact on schools, including 24 respondents concerned over restricted ability to drop off children at schools.

Complementary measures
23 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on complementary measures, including:

• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested improved education and training for cyclists (5) and motorists (3)
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested widening pavements
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested improving the road network as part of the scheme

Impact on churches
19 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about pedestrian and cyclist conflict around churches.

Policy
16 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on policy, including 11 respondents suggested cycling legislation is updated (8 respondents suggesting to give better protection to pedestrians).

Impact on residents
11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about access to properties, including 7 concerned the proposals will prevent deliveries to residents.

Construction impacts
3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about disruption during construction.
Section F: Chiswick High Road (from Goldhawk Road to Heathfield Terrace)

(Question 8 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for Chiswick High Road?”)

1,959 of the 5,388 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Chiswick High Road. Percentages are calculated from the overall number of respondents and where above one per cent have been rounded. Only comments that occurred more then twice are included.

General comments are presented first. Other comments have been grouped into the categories below listed in order of how frequently they were mentioned (insert hyperlinks).

General

Impact on pedestrians
Impact on motorists
Cycle infrastructure
Principles of the scheme
Economic impacts
Impact on Our Lady and St Edward’s Church
Cyclist behaviour
Environmental impacts
Junctions
Impact on bus users
Impact on cyclists
Impact on residents
Safety implications in general
Policy
Complementary measures
Impacts on schools
Construction impacts
General

There were 354 general comments about the proposals for Chiswick High Road

- 219 (4 per cent) respondents made a general comment in support of the scheme such as “great”
- 135 (3 per cent) respondents made a general comment opposing the scheme such as “bad idea”
- 30 (<1 per cent) respondents commented about other sections of the proposed route
- 17 (<1 per cent) respondents made comments out of the scope of the project

Impact on pedestrians

1,773 (32 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to the impacts on pedestrians at Chiswick High Road. These comments have been divided into the following categories: pavements, vulnerable groups, safety, general impacts on pedestrians, crossings, congestion, conflict and seating.

Pavements

431 (8 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to pavements, including:

- 152 (3 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about that the wide pavement would be reallocated to cyclists
- 130 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned reducing wide pavements would ruin the pavement culture
- 70 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that reducing pavement space would mean no space for mothers with baby strollers
- 29 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned there is not enough pavement space to fit a cycle lane
- 25 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at possible pinch points including British Grove (6), Our Lady Grace and St Edwards Church (4)
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned pedestrians typically use the north side of the road more than the south
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested increasing the pavement area
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested use of continuous pedestrian footways
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the cycle track should be on the south side of the road as there are fewer pedestrians on this side
Vulnerable groups
414 (8 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the proposals for Chiswick High Road on vulnerable people including children (178), elderly (151) and disabled people (84).

Safety
390 (7 per cent) respondents commented on the safety implications of the proposals, including:

- 186 (3 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would increase the safety risk to pedestrians
- 165 (3 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would increase pedestrian/cyclist conflict
- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that pedestrians would not expect cyclists to be on pavements
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cyclists were difficult to see and therefore a danger to pedestrians
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested building taller kerb stones to avoid pedestrians walking on the cycle track
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported proposals which would improve pedestrian safety
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned for pedestrian safety specifically at British Grove

General impacts on pedestrians
260 (5 per cent) respondents commented on the general impacts on pedestrians, including:

- 146 (3 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would negatively impact pedestrians
- 67 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the reallocation of footpaths would increase pedestrian congestion
- 46 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the cycle superhighway would cause severance between the north and south sides of the road

Crossings
185 (3 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to crossings under the proposals for Chiswick High Road, including:

- 110 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would make it more difficult to cross the road
- 28 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the removal of crossings
• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested minimising wait times and maximising crossing times for pedestrians
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned slower walking pedestrians would not have enough time to cross the track and road
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested shortening crossing lengths by reducing the number of traffic lanes

**Congestion**

63 (1 per cent) respondents were concerned at the current pedestrian congestion at Chiswick High Road.

**Conflict**

20 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues of conflict from the proposals at Chiswick High Road, including:

• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned for dogs
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would create confusion for pedestrians
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about pedestrian/motorist conflict at Duke Road

**Seating**

9 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned about the decrease in on-street seating

**Impact on motorists**

1,058 (20 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Chiswick High Road to affect motorists. These comments have been divided into the following categories: congestion, parking, through traffic, road layout, access, conflict, emergency services, signals, safety and attitude.

**Congestion**

699 (13 per cent) respondents commented on congestion issues at Chiswick High Road

• 441 (8 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would worsen existing congestion in the area. 193 respondents were concerned in general, 32 concerned about rat running and 24 about congestion in the rush hour. Some respondents mentioned congestion in specific areas, these included Duke’s Avenue and Duke Road (mentioned by 34 respondents), Goldhawk Road (10), Heathfield Terrace (0), Turnham Green (8), Devonshire Road (7), Chiswick Lane (6), Bourne Place(4), British Grove (4), Sutton Court Road (3), Fisher’s Lane (3) and St Peters Square (3)
• 181 (3 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over current levels of congestion in the area. Some respondents mentioned congestion in specific areas, these included Duke’s Avenue and Duke Road (14), Chiswick Lane (5), congestion from traffic leaving the M4 at Sutton Court Road (7), British Grove (7) and Turnham Green (3)
• 50 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that journey times would increase for motorists
• 16 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about lack of plans to manage traffic demand when the A4 is congested
• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported the scheme because it would reduce congestion
• 7(<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cycle lanes would have a disproportionate effect on traffic during off peak periods

Parking
114 (2 per cent) respondents commented on parking issues from the proposals for Chiswick High Road, including:
• 35 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were opposed to the loss of parking at Chiswick High Road
• 15 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over parking restrictions, 5 of these by the Police Station
• 12 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on parking at Linden Gardens including concern over limited amounts of parking (4), suggesting resident only parking (4) and, opposing proposals for pay for use parking (4)
• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on parking at Duke’s Avenue and Duke Road, including suggesting parking is forbidden at Duke’s Avenue and Duke Road (5), suggesting traffic flow is prioritised over parking at Duke Road (3)
• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over current limited amounts of parking
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned shoppers will be forced to use resident parking on minor roads
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were opposed to the loss of loading bays

Through traffic
58 (1 per cent) respondents commented on implications for through traffic from the proposals at Chiswick High Road, including:
• Concern about increased “rat running”: Duke’s Avenue and Duke Road (10), Devonshire Road (5), Bedford Park (4), Wavendon Avenue (4), in general (4), Alwvn Avenue (3), Bath Road (3), South Parade (3)
3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested closing Duke’s Avenue and Duke Road to through traffic

Road layout
48 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on road layout issues from the proposals at Chiswick High Road, including:

- 15 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the proposed road layout is confusing/ complicated including 3 specifically mentioning Chiswick Lane
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the removal of traffic lanes will decrease road capacity
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that traffic should be directed down the A4

Access
45 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on access issues from the proposals at Chiswick High Road, including:

- 24 (<1 per cent) respondents mentioned British Grove including 11 who opposed changing traffic direction, 7 who were concerned about access to minor roads and 4 who had concerns about access to the nursery
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the junction at Linden Gardens
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over restricted access to the A4 due to cycle priority at exit of minor roads at Homefield Road and Airedale Avenue

Conflict
29 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the difficulty crossing two-way cycle tracks.

Emergency services
23 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about delays or access for emergency vehicles.

Signals
11 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to signals including 6 respondents who mentioned Duke Road – and concerns that an exit without signals is dangerous due to the proximity of Fisher’s Lane.

Safety
6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned for motorist safety.
Attitude
3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the number of road rage incidents would increase.

Cycle infrastructure
691 (13 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to cycle infrastructure from the proposals for Chiswick High Road. These comments have been divided into the following categories: route of the track, reallocation, segregation, access, track, signals, crossings, signage and markings and cycle parking.

Route of track
397 (7 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to the route of the track, including:

- 219 (4 per cent) respondents suggested that the A4 would be a better alternative route, 129 of these saying this because it would separate pedestrians from cyclists
- 76 (1 per cent) respondents said they opposed the route on Chiswick High Road
- 36 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested other alternative route suggestions, 12 of which suggested an alternative route along the riverside, 6 to Chiswick Business Park, 5 mentioning using alternative route along quieter roads
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that cyclists use the existing bus lanes
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the cycle track is located on the north side of Chiswick High Road
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned that westbound cyclists cannot continue straight on (Chiswick High Road junction with Heathfield Terrace)
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned that track switching is dangerous as cyclists would just continue on the road instead
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned about a pinch point between Duke’s Avenue and Heathfield Terrace

Reallocation
80 (1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to the reallocation of road space, including:

- 57 (1 per cent) respondents suggested the reallocation of road space over pavements for cyclists, 3 of these specifically mentioning between Duke’s Avenue and Duke Road
- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the proposed reallocation of road space
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested using wide pavements for cycle tracks
Segregation

53 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to the segregation of cycle tracks, including:

- 35 (<1 per cent) respondents supported segregated cycle tracks, 15 of these suggested the whole route should be segregated without interruptions
- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned whether the cycle tracks would be of sufficient width to allow overtaking
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested putting physical barriers between cycles, cars and pedestrians for safety

Access

40 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about access issues from the proposals for Chiswick High Road, including:

- 29 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned how to join the Cycle Superhighway from minor roads including 12 at Chiswick High Road, 5 Fisher’s Lane, 4 Goldhawk Road, 3 Prebend Gardens
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at the lack of access to minor roads from the westbound segregated track

Track

42 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the proposals for the track, including:

- 29 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested maximising the track width
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the cycle track would be within door width of cars

Signals

22 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that there should be signals which would give priority to cyclists.

Crossings

16 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to crossings, including:

- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about north-south cycle crossings at Chiswick High Road
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the sharp left turn for cyclists crossing the road is dangerous at Heathfield Terrace

Signage and markings

15 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to signage and markings, including:
• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents suggesting there should be clear signage, 7 of which mentioned across junctions and 4 to highlight cycle priority
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were opposed to increased signage

Cycle parking
11 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to cycle parking, including:
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that more cycle parking may be needed as demand increases
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that bike racks may reduce pavement space

Principles of the scheme
626 (12 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to the principles of the scheme for Chiswick High Road. These comments have been divided into the following categories: prioritisation of modes, conservation areas, uptake of cycling, Cycle Superhighways.

Prioritisation of modes
264 (5 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to the prioritisation of modes, including:
• 83 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the scheme does not benefit motorists or pedestrians
• 81 (2 per cent) respondents opposed the scheme, and considered the changes were not needed to accommodate cyclists
• 17 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme is anti-motorist
• 16 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested prioritising public transport
• 15 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested pedestrians should be prioritised
• 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme does not meet TfL's London Cycling Design Standards
• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed prioritising cyclists over bus users
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed prioritising the use of shared space at Chiswick Lane
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed prioritising cyclists over pedestrians
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents supported prioritising motorists over other modes
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned the scheme is anti-pedestrian
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents supported prioritising active travel over cars
Conservation areas

276 (5 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to the conservation areas and impacts, including:

- 244 (5 per cent) respondents were concerned that the history, tradition, feel of the area would be negatively affected
- 32 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported the benefits the scheme would bring to the village character and businesses

Uptake of cycling

72 (1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to the uptake of cycling, including:

- 39 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that scheme will not encourage uptake of cycling
- 17 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested reducing the priority of motorists to promote mode shift
- 16 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cycle tracks will be underused

Cycle Superhighways

12 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to Cycle Superhighways. 6 of these suggested that lessons from previous Cycle Superhighways should be incorporated into the scheme.

Economic impacts

593 (11 per cent) respondents commented on the economic impacts of the proposals for Chiswick High Road. These comments have been divided into the following categories: business impacts, funding and property.

Business impacts

501 (9 per cent) respondents commented on the business impacts, including:

- 206 (4 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the scheme would negatively impact the businesses of Chiswick
- 156 (3 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over the loss of street and café culture
- 47 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the loss of pavement will restrict pedestrian access to businesses
- 41 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned businesses would be affected by loss of parking
- 24 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned businesses would be affected by restricted access and delivery times
Funding

86 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the funding issues, including:

- 62 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over the costs of the scheme
- 18 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the money could be spent elsewhere
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they considered the primary purpose of the scheme was to make money through parking fines

Property

6 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned that the proposals would devalue local properties.

Impact on Our Lady & St Edward’s Church

563 (10 per cent) respondents commented on the implications of the proposals for the Church, including:

- 156 (3 per cent) respondents were concerned about narrowing the pavement outside the church
- 113 (2 per cent) respondents said they opposed the cycle lane in front of the church
- 93 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the religious community and their ability to worship will negatively impacted
- 64 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about cyclist/pedestrian conflict outside the church
- 25 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about limited access to the church because of the proposals
- 18 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned for lack of loading bays and parking outside the church
- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about pedestrians crossing the cycle superhighway for religious events
- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the congregations have not been consulted or accounted for
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cycle track is diverted around the church instead of on the pavement in front
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the side door has limited pavement space
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the cycle track is located on the other side of the row of trees
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the pavement is widened at Duke’s Avenue
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the church uses side door entrance onto Duke's Avenue
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested a dismount and walk scheme is implemented on Sunday or during events
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the proposals around the church
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned that church drop-off for disabled residents will be negatively impacted
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the church opposition is unfounded as they do not own the pavement
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested a barrier outside the church to prevent pedestrians walking onto the cycle track
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the cycle path joins the road as mixed use outside the church

Cyclist behaviour
483 (9 per cent) respondents commented on the issues relating to cyclist behaviour from the proposals for Chiswick High Road. These comments have been divided into the following categories: speed, attitude and compliance.

Speed
208 (4 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to cyclist speed including:

• 183 (3 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that speeding cyclists pose a danger to pedestrians and 25 of these suggested a speed limit for cyclists

Attitude
147 (3 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to attitude, including:

• 43 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cyclists would not use the cycle tracks, 3 mentioning specifically at times of bad weather
• 38 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over lack of cyclist awareness of other road users
• 38 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about aggressive cycling, 4 mentioning specifically abusive language
• 26 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were the proposals would encourage dangerous cycling behaviour

Compliance
128 (2 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to compliance, including:
• 70 (1 per cent) respondents concerned at cyclists not stopping at red lights
• 57 (1 per cent) respondents who said they were concerned cyclists disregard the Highway Code, including riding on pavements (20) and without lights at night (4)

Environmental impacts
451 (8 per cent) respondents commented on the environmental issues relating to the proposals for Chiswick High Road. These comments have been divided into the following categories: air quality and pollution, greening infrastructure, aesthetics and noise.

Air quality and pollution
214 (4 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to air quality and pollution, including:
• 129 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned pollution will increase due to stationary traffic or congestion
• 21 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned pollution will increase due to increased journey times
• 20 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over current levels of pollution
• 18 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that proposals will worsen air quality
• 16 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the scheme due to air quality benefits
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the healthy streets aim of lower pollution

Greening infrastructure
197 (4 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to greening infrastructure, including:
• 115 (2 per cent) respondents opposed plans to remove trees, 3 specifically mentioning Mayfield Avenue
• 48 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned removal of trees will spoil aesthetics, the quality of the environment or increase CO2 levels
• 13 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested planting of new trees to enhance urban realm
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that trees will take a long time to regrow
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that proposals will cause damage to trees
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported the retention of mature trees
Aesthetics
27 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme would damage the aesthetics of the area.

Noise
11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about noise.

Junctions
354 (7 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to junctions from the proposals for Chiswick High Road. These comments have been divided into the following categories: minor roads, conflict, signals, congestion, access, signage and markings

Minor roads
153 (3 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to minor roads, including:

- 63 (1 per cent) respondents opposed entry only Duke’s Avenue
- 59 (1 per cent) respondents opposed exit only Duke Road
- 15 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested junctions are considered more carefully
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested opposite route for one-way system Duke Road and Duke’s Avenue
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents supported one way system Duke Road and Duke’s Avenue
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested opposite route for one-way system Bourne Place

Conflict
76 (1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to conflict, including:

- 40 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about motorists having to give-way to cycle path with poor sightlines. Specific locations mentioned included Duke Road (10), Linden Gardens (8), Airedale Avenue (4), Netheravon Road (4), Homefield Road (3)
- 21 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned it would be difficult or dangerous to exit junctions. Specific locations mentioned included Duke Road (7), British Grove (4) and Goldhawk Road (4)
- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about safety of cyclists and motorists if right turn removed Duke’s Avenue

Signals
40 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to signals, including:
• 21 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested traffic lights to assist exit onto Chiswick High Road, including 18 respondents mentioning Duke Road and 3 British Grove
• 12 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned there were too many traffic lights proposed for Chiswick High Road

**Congestion**

31 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would increase traffic at Duke Road and Duke’s Avenue.

**Access**

36 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to access, including:

• 17 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at the removal of the right turn for motorists at Heathfield Terrace
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over access to minor roads

**Signage and markings**

6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested “give way” markings for cars giving way to cyclists at minor roads

**Impact on bus users**

295 (5 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to the impact on bus users from the proposals for Chiswick High Road. These comments have been divided into the following categories: journey times and congestion, bus lanes and bus services.

**Journey times and congestion**

134 (2 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to journey times and congestion, including:

• 95 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the removal of bus lane will increase bus journey times and/or increase congestion
• 21 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over increased bus journey times
• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about cyclist/pedestrian conflict when boarding buses
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the relocation of bus stops will cause congestion at the Stamford Brook Bus Garage junction

**Bus lanes**

79 (1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to bus lanes, including:
• 51 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed removal of westbound bus lane
• 23 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about delays from removal of bus lane
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested longer bus lane operating hours
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested removal of eastbound bus lane

**Bus services**

23 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to bus services, including:

• 16 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme will negatively impact bus users
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested decreasing number of bus services

Impact on cyclists

274 (5 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to the impact on cyclists from the proposals for Chiswick High Road. These comments have been divided into the following categories: safety, uptake of cycling, conflict.

**Safety**

151 (3 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to safety, including:

• 91 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over safety where cycle tracks pass minor roads
• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about safety of cyclists
• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that current layout is dangerous for cyclists
• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported further restrictions on entry/exit to minor roads
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that two-way tracks makes cycling conditions more dangerous
• 5(<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over delivery vehicles crossing cycle track
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over aggressive driving

**Uptake of cycling**

82 (2 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to the uptake of cycling. 81 of these said they were concerned the scheme favours commuter cyclists over local cyclists.
Conflict
29 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over cyclist/motorist conflict and/or that the proposals would increase tensions.

Impact on residents
201 (4 per cent) respondents commented on the impacts on residents, including:

- 135 (3 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that closing roads would reduce residents ability to access the area. Specific locations mentioned were: Duke’s Avenue and Duke Road (32), British Grove (23), Glebe Estate (20), Chiswick High Road (17), Linden Gardens (8), Devonshire Road (7), Airedale Avenue (6), Bourne Place (4), Brackley Road (3), Heathfield Terrace (3)
- 45 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would negatively impact residents who live near the route
- 15 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would prevent deliveries to local residents
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the impact of “rat running” on residents

Safety implications in general
136 (3 per cent) respondents commented on general safety implications of the proposals, including:

- 102 (2 per cent) respondents supported safer cycling infrastructure in London
- 25 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned proposals will decrease safety for all road users, 4 specifically mentioning Duke Road and Duke’s Avenue
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about thefts of handbags by cyclists

Policy
99 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the policy implications of the proposals. These comments have been divided into new policies, enforcement and economy.

New policies
- 37 (<1 per cent) respondents supported policies designed to increase cycling uptake
- 23 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested regulation of cyclists including insurance (9), registration (9), and being licenced (5)
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cyclists should be taxed to pay for infrastructure

**Enforcement**

25 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on enforcement issues. 22 suggested stricter enforcement of cycling only infrastructure.

**Economy**

4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested policies to support local businesses.

**Complementary measures**

83 (2 per cent) respondents commented on complementary measures related to the proposals. These comments have been divided into infrastructure, education and training, mode shift and access.

**Infrastructure**

28 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on infrastructure measures, including:

• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned there would be insufficient capacity in the proposals to accommodate future growth (from places such as Brentford FC Stadium, Business Park etc)
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the A4 cycle lanes are improved
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested removing street clutter to gain pavement space
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested roads are resurfaced

**Education and training**

22 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested improved education and training, 14 mentioned for cyclists and 7 for motorists.

**Mode shift**

22 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested measures to encourage mode shift including 18 responses with suggestions for policies to encourage walking.

**Access**

4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that access to amenities and businesses is improved.

**Impact on schools**

50 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact of the proposals for Chiswick High Road on schools, including:
- 43 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals near schools are dangerous to children, 3 specifically mentioning Belmont School
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over restricted ability to drop children off near schools
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would negatively impact schools

Construction impacts

28 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on construction impacts. 24 respondents said they were concerned over disruption during construction.
Section G: Heathfield Terrace/ Wellesley Road (between Chiswick High Road and Capital Interchange Way)

(Question 10 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for Heathfield Terrace/ Wellesley Road?”)

1,171 of the 5,388 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Heathfield Terrace/ Wellesley Road. Percentages are calculated from the overall number of respondents and where above one per cent have been rounded. Only comments that occurred more than twice are included.

General comments are presented first. Other comments have been grouped into the categories below listed in order of how frequently they were mentioned (insert hyperlinks).

General
Impact on motorists
Cycle infrastructure
Junctions
Impact on cyclists
Impact on residents
Environmental impacts
Impact on pedestrians
Principles of the scheme
Complementary measures
Cyclist behaviour
Economic impacts
Impact on bus users
Impact on schools
Policy
Safety
Construction impacts
General

There were 160 general comments about the proposals for Heathfield Terrace/Wellesley Road:

- 59 (1 per cent) respondents made a general comment in support of the scheme such as “great”
- 48 (<1 per cent) respondents made a general comment opposing the scheme such as “bad idea”
- 36 (<1 per cent) respondents commented about other sections of the proposed route
- 17 (<1 per cent) respondents made comments out of the scope of the project

Impact on motorists

533 (10 per cent) respondents commented on impacts on motorists from the proposals at Heathfield Terrace/Wellesley Road. These comments have been divided into the following categories: congestion and journey times, through traffic, parking, road layout, impact on other road users, emergency services and signals.

**Congestion and journey times**

376 (7 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to congestion, including:

- 184 (3 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would increase congestion including Chiswick High Road (49), Chiswick Roundabout (32), Oxford Road North/Burlington Road (18), Heathfield Terrace/Wellesley Road (15), Kew Bridge Road (4), Sutton Lane North (4), on the A4 (3)
- 75 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at current levels of congestion, including Chiswick Roundabout (19), Chiswick High Road (16), Heathfield Terrace/Wellesley Road (7)
- 34 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would increase journey times including 4 respondents mentioning Wellesley Road/Stile Hall Gardens
- 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would not help to reduce traffic volumes around Wellesley Road
- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the Brentford FC development would increase local congestion
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned other local development plans would increase congestion

**Through traffic**

88 (2 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to through traffic, including:
• 55 (1 per cent) respondents supported the proposals as they reduce through traffic  
• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents supported traffic reduction through road closures  
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned traffic would be pushed down residential roads  
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned over the increase in cars forced to turn round in Wellesley Road  
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested restricting through traffic such as lorries and vans  
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested monitoring traffic levels to ensure they are sufficiently low  
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the “Waze” app directs traffic to residential roads such as Wellesley Road

Parking
19 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on parking, including:  
  • 14 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested new parking restrictions are introduced at Wellesley Road  
  • 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over parking restrictions

Road layout
18 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on road layout, including:  
  • 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would create confusion for road users  
  • 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about residents car parking  
  • 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned Brooks Road would become the only entry/exit point to Chiswick Village and surrounding streets  
  • 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at the removal of traffic lanes

Impact on other road users
8 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned at the negative impact on other road users.

Emergency services
5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at emergency vehicle access
Signals
5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested lights are phased to promote better traffic flow, including 4 mentioning Chiswick Roundabout.

Cycle infrastructure
344 (6 per cent) respondents commented on cycle infrastructure proposals at Heathfield Terrace/ Wellesley Road. These comments have been divided into the following categories: segregation, route of track and suggested links, current conditions, signage and markings.

Segregation
117 (2 per cent) respondents commented on segregation, including:

- 80 (1 per cent) respondents suggested that the whole route should be segregated
- 30 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the lack of segregation
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cyclists should share the road space with motor traffic

Route of track and suggested links
117 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the route of track and suggested links, including:

- 98 (2 per cent) respondents made suggestions for the route of the track, including alongside the A4 (41), Chiswick High Road to Chiswick Roundabout (18), Turnham Green (8), by the river (6)
- 19 (<1 per cent) respondents gave suggested links including to Chiswick Business Park (6) and with segregated cycle tracks on the A4 (3)

Current conditions
88 (2 per cent) respondents commented on current conditions, including:

- 44 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the road and pavements are too narrow for the proposals
- 24 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that current cycling conditions are satisfactory
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that current cycling conditions are unsatisfactory
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned about the pinch point at the pedestrian crossing near Wellesley Road, near Sutton Lane North roundabout
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned that when roads are busy, cyclists cannot pass at Heathfield Terrace
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned that the area will be unable to cope with the increased volume of cyclists

**Signage and markings**

11 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on signage and markings including 3 who suggested clear signage to highlight cyclist priority to motorists.

**Junctions**

342 (6 per cent) respondents commented on junctions proposals at Heathfield Terrace/ Wellesley Road. These comments have been divided into the following categories: access, safety and road layout.

**Access**

226 (4 per cent) respondents commented on access, including:

• 59 (1 per cent) respondents opposed restricting access to the South Circular from Wellesley Road
• 48 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that closing access to the South Circular would force more traffic onto Chiswick High Road
• 36 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that closing access to the South Circular would force more traffic onto Chiswick roundabout
• 26 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed restricting access to the South Circular from Stile Hall Gardens
• 17 (<1 per cent) respondents supported restricting access to the South Circular from Wellesley Road
• 12 (<1 per cent) respondents supported restricting access to the South Circular from Stile Hall Gardens
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed closing the right turn from Chiswick High Road onto Heathfield Terrace
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents supported closing access to the South Circular for Stile Hall Gardens but not Wellesley Road
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested having one road to exit and one road to enter (Wellesley Road and Stile Hall Gardens)

**Safety**

64 (1 per cent) respondents commented on safety, including:

• 55 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposed mini-roundabout (at Wellesley Road/Heathfield Terrace/Sutton Lane North roundabout) was inadequate or unsafe
3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the Sutton Court Road/Heathfield Terrace junction is dangerous

Road layout

36 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on road layout, including:

- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the proposed give way junction at Brooks Road
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the replacement of the mini-roundabout at Brooks Road needs to consider cyclists
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents supported new raised entry treatment throughout the section
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at the junction of Wellesley Road and Oxford Road North

Impact on cyclists

103 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on cyclists at Heathfield Terrace/Wellesley Road. These comments have been divided into the following categories: current conditions, safety, conflict and minor roads.

Current conditions

30 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on current conditions, including:

- 25 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that traffic levels make Heathfield Terrace/Wellesley Road unsuitable as “quiet roads” for cycling
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that lorries and buses make cycling unsafe and unpleasant

Safety

25 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on safety, including:

- 17 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported the scheme as it will make cycling safer
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that parked cars pose a risk to cyclists

Conflict

24 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on conflict, including:

- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about vehicles crossing the two way track
- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about cyclist/motorist conflict
Minor roads

22 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on minor roads, including:

- 19 (<1 per cent) respondents supported further restrictions on entry/exit to minor roads to improve cyclist safety
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned traffic levels will increase, making Heathfield Terrace/ Wellesley Road unsuitable as quiet roads in the future

Impact on residents

101 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on residents at Heathfield Terrace/ Wellesley Road. These comments have been divided into the following categories: priority, congestion, access and speeding.

Priority

35 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on priority, including:

- 24 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that Cycle Superhighways negatively impact residents which live nearby
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the scheme as it would benefit residents
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the scheme unfairly priorities residents wishes at Wellesley Road/Stile Hall Gardens

Congestion

28 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on congestion, saying they were concerned about the impact of “rat running” on residents.

Access

21 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that closing roads would reduce residents ability to access the area.

Speeding

17 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over speeding traffic in residential areas.

Environmental impacts

93 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the environmental impacts at Heathfield Terrace/ Wellesley Road, including:

- 57 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that congestion would increase as a result of pollution
• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the measures which would reduce pollution
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over current levels of pollution caused by stationary traffic

Impact on pedestrians

67 (1 per cent) respondents commented on the impacts on pedestrians at Heathfield Terrace/ Wellesley Road, including:

• 18 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the proposals would make the area less safe for pedestrians
• 12 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over the reduction of walking space
• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the impacts on children, elderly and disabled people
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the proposals which would improve pedestrian safety
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that widening the pavement is unnecessary at Sutton Lane North/Walpole Gardens
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested continuous pedestrian crossings
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that Wellesley Road was not appealing to pedestrians

Principles of the scheme

66 (1 per cent) respondents commented on the principles of the scheme, including:

• 21 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the proposals do not do enough to encourage the uptake of cycling
• 15 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed prioritising cyclists
• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cycle tracks would be underused
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents supported prioritising active travel over cars
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents supported prioritising environmentally friendly public transport
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the scheme should be considered as a part of a greater scheme to improve conditions for all users

Complementary measures

53 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested complementary measures, including traffic calming measures (25) and 20mph speed limits (14).
Cyclist behaviour

39 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on cyclist behaviour, including:

- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said that they were concerned over speeding cyclists
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned cyclists will not use the cycling tracks
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned cyclists do not obey traffic lights
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned cyclists had no regard for pedestrians

Economic impacts

37 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the economic impacts of the proposals, including:

- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over the loss of street/café culture
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the economic impacts on local shops and businesses
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the costs of the scheme
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme would be a waste of money
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the scheme would negatively impact the London economy

Impact on bus users

17 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on bus users. 11 said they were concerned that the proposals would cause delays to buses.

Impact on schools

15 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on schools, including:

- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the proposals near schools are dangerous to children
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the proposals as they will enable safe routes to schools
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over restricted ability to drop children off at school.
Policy
16 (<1 per cent) respondents made suggestions policy issues, including:

- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested new legislation to ensure cyclists follow the Highway Code
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cyclists should be insured
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cyclists should be registered

Safety
13 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on safety issues, including:

- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would decrease road safety for all road users
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the proposals due to safety benefits for all road users

Construction impacts
9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the congestion and disruption which would be caused by the construction of the scheme.
Section H: South Circular Road (Kew Bridge Station)

(Question 10 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for the South Circular Road (Kew Bridge Station)?”)

985 of the 5,388 respondents provided comments on the proposals for the South Circular Road (Kew Bridge Station). Percentages are calculated from the overall number of respondents and where above one per cent have been rounded. Only comments that occurred more than twice are included.

General comments are presented first. Other comments have been grouped into the categories below listed in order of how frequently they were mentioned (insert hyperlinks).

General
Cycle infrastructure
Impact on motorists
Junctions
Impact on pedestrians
Impact on cyclists
Principles of the scheme
Environmental impacts
Cyclist behaviour
Policy
Complementary measures
Safety
Economic impacts
Impact on bus users
Impact on residents
Scope of scheme
Construction impacts
General
There were 124 general comments about the proposals for the South Circular Road

- 53 (<1 per cent) respondents made a general comment in support of the scheme such as “great”
- 27 (<1 per cent) respondents made a general comment opposing the scheme such as “bad idea”
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents commented about other sections of the proposed route
- 38 (<1 per cent) respondents made comments out of the scope of the project

Cycle infrastructure
372 (7 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to cycling infrastructure at the South Circular Road (Kew Bridge). These comments have been divided into the following categories: Kew Bridge/ station, track, route of track and suggested links.

Kew Bridge/ station
244 (5 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to congestion, including:

- 113 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about cyclist safety at the bus stop
- 84 (2 per cent) respondents suggested more consideration for getting cyclists safely on and off the bridge
- 43 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested a bus stop bypass with segregated cycle track

Track
75 (1 per cent) respondents commented on the track, including:

- 15 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported segregated cycle tracks
- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the phasing of traffic lights to encourage smooth cycle traffic
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the whole route should be segregated
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested more lanes be given over to cycle infrastructure
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed segregated cycle tracks
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents supported two way tracks
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about sharing space with buses in bus lanes
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the road and pavement are too narrow for the proposals
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about access to the northbound section of the South Circular Road from Kew Bridge

Route of track and suggested links
47 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the route of the track and suggested links, including:

• 19 (<1 per cent) suggested an alternative route along the A4
• 4 (<1 per cent) suggested an alternative route along the riverside
• 3 (<1 per cent) suggested tunnels for cyclists rather than the Cycle Superhighway
• 3 (<1 per cent) suggested elevating the Cycle Superhighway above the road

Impact on motorists
340 (6 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to the impacts on motorists at the South Circular Road (Kew Bridge). These comments have been divided into the following categories: congestion and journey times, road layout, signage and markings, other.

Congestion and journey times
282 (5 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to congestion including:

• 119 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about current levels of congestion including Kew Bridge (20), Chiswick Roundabout (20), Chiswick High Road (4), Lionel Road South (4)
• 110 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals will increase congestion including Chiswick Roundabout (13), Kew Bridge (10), South Circular Road/Chiswick High Road (6), Brentford High Street (3)
• 21 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that there would be increased journey times. 3 respondents mentioned Chiswick Roundabout.
• 17 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the Brentford FC development will increase local congestion
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned closing access to the South Circular Road will force more traffic onto other roads. 4 respondents mentioned closing access from Wellesley Road will force more traffic onto Chiswick Roundabout

Road layout
32 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to the road layout, including:
• 22 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at the removal of traffic lanes at Kew Bridge Road
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposed road layout is confusing. 5 respondents mentioned Kew Bridge junction.

**Signage and markings**
7 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to signage and markings, including:

• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the yellow box at Strand-on-the-Green is not necessary
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested expanding or more extensive use of yellow box road markings

**Other**
There were 19 other comments made about impacts on motorists, including 3 respondents who said they were concerned about the negative impacts on other road users in general.

**Junctions**
207 (4 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to the junctions at the South Circular Road (Kew Bridge). These comments have been divided into the following categories: safety and road layout, motorist access, cyclist access and signals.

**Safety and road layout**
79 (1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to safety and road layout, including:

• 32 (<1 per cent) respondents mentioned Lionel Road South. Comments included the existing junction with concern the junction is dangerous (9) and there are dangerous levels of traffic (4). There was concern about a potential left hook risk from the proposals (13), and a suggestion to ban right hand turn from westbound direction (3)
• 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that Kew Bridge junction is currently difficult to navigate and needs improvements (10), and concerned about vehicles blocking the junction (4)
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the Strand-on-the-Green junction was dangerous
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they opposed the new signalised crossing at Kew Bridge Station
Motorist access
60 (1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to motorist access, including:

- 40 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed stopping access to the South Circular, from Wellesley Road (25) and Stile Hall Gardens (15)
- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the lack of access to Wellesley Road from Capital Interchange Way
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents supported stopping access to the South Circular from Stile Hall Gardens (4) and Wellesley Road (2)

Cyclist access
58 (1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to cyclist access, including:

- 41 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that cyclists travelling along Capital Interchange Way should be able to join CS9 in either direction
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about access to Wellesley Road from the South Circular
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the right turn onto Kew Road is not intuitive for cyclists

Signals
13 (<1 per cent) respondents mentioned signals at Kew Bridge including concern over traffic light phasing (5), and suggestions to give cyclists priority at signals (3).

Impact on pedestrians
153 (3 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on pedestrians at the South Circular Road (Kew Bridge). These comments have been divided into the following categories: crossings, safety and pavements.

Crossings
60 (1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to crossings, including:

- 23 (<1 per cent) respondents supported new crossings, including at Kew Bridge Station (15)
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the current road layout at Kew Bridge is confusing for pedestrians
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over staggered crossings
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned pedestrians would have to wait too long to cross the road
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over the location of the crossing at Kew Bridge Station
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned pedestrians can be stranded in islands
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested new crossings at Lionel Road South

Safety
53 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to pedestrian safety, including:

• 12 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme would increase pedestrian/ cyclist conflict
• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents supported proposals which improved pedestrian safety
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about pedestrian safety in general
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the impacts on vulnerable groups including children, elderly and disabled people
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about pedestrian safety especially because of the number of schools in the area
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the needs of pedestrians are considered

Pavements
38 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to pavements, including:

• 17 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the reduction in pavement space, including 7 respondents who said pavements were already very narrow
• 16 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested taking measures about bridge pillars that reduce pavement width and collect rubbish

Impact on cyclists
97 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on cyclists at the South Circular Road (Kew Bridge). These comments have been divided into the following categories: current conditions and safety.

Current conditions
55 (1 per cent) respondents said the current route is unsafe/ unpleasant to use, including Kew Bridge (10) and the South Circular Road (3).

Safety
33 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on safety issues, including:
21 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about insufficient protection for cyclists
9 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the scheme as it would make cycling more dangerous

Principles of the scheme
95 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on the principles of the scheme. These comments have been divided into the following categories: prioritisation of modes, uptake of cycling, and new developments.

Prioritisation of modes
47 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the prioritisation of modes, including:
- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the scheme, saying that changes are not needed to accommodate cyclists
- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the scheme should not be implemented at the expense of other modes
- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the strategy does not consider motorists
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed prioritising cyclists, 2 respondents mentioned over bus users
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the scheme should be considered as part of a greater scheme to improve for all road users
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that public transport should be improved instead

Uptake of cycling
27 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the uptake of cycling, including:
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned cycle tracks would be under used
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that other similar schemes have not made a difference
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that missing links to the cycle network will discourage less experienced cyclists
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme would not encourage the uptake of cycling

New developments
15 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned that new building developments have not been considered in the scheme.
Environmental impacts

42 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the environmental impacts, including:

- 25 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over current levels of pollution caused by stationary traffic
- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned pollution would increase, due to stationary traffic (9), and increased journey times (3)
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested planting new trees to enhance the urban realm

Cyclist behaviour

32 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on cyclist behaviour, including:

- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about aggressive cycling
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about speeding cyclists

Policy

25 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on policy issues including:

- 21 (<1 per cent) respondents made suggestions for cycling legislation, including licensing cyclists (7), cycling legislation should be updated (6) and cyclists should be insured (6)
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested stricter enforcement against drivers who block junctions and crossings

Complementary measures

23 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on complementary measures including:

- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about insufficient capacity to accommodate future growth
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested improved education and training, including cyclists (3)
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested clear signage to highlight cyclist priority to drivers

Safety

19 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on safety issues including:

- 15 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the proposals due to safety benefits for all road users
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would increase the number of accidents

Economic impacts
18 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on economic impacts, including 11 who said they were concerned over the costs of the scheme.

Impact on bus users
18 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on safety issues including:

• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about increased journey times
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the removal of bus lanes

Impact on residents
14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that Cycle Superhighways negatively impact residents which live near cycle tracks.

Scope of the scheme
8 (<1 per cent) respondents made suggestions for extending the scheme including 4 respondents who said cycle tracks should extend beyond Kew Bridge.

Construction impacts
3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over disruption during construction
Section I: Kew Bridge Road/Watermans Park/ Brentford High Street (East)

(Question 11 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for Kew Bridge Road/ Watermans Park/Brentford High Street (East)?”)

623 of the 5,388 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Kew Bridge Road/Watermans Park/Brentford High Street (East). Percentages are calculated from the overall number of respondents and where above one per cent have been rounded. Only comments that occurred more than twice are included.

General comments are presented first. Other comments have been grouped into the categories below listed in order of how frequently they were mentioned (insert hyperlinks).
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Principles of the scheme

Impact on pedestrians

Safety
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Impact on churches

Policy

Construction impacts
General
There were 151 general comments about the proposals for Kew Bridge Road/Watermans Park/ Brentford High Street (East):

- 66 (1 per cent) respondents made a general comment in support of the scheme such as “great”
- 47 (<1 per cent) respondents made a general comment opposing the scheme such as “bad idea”
- 24 (<1 per cent) respondents made comments out of the scope of the project
- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents commented about other sections of the proposed route

Cycle infrastructure
350 (6 per cent) respondents commented on the proposed cycle infrastructure in the area. These comments have been divided into the following categories: Watermans Park, segregation, route of track, current conditions, track and access.

Watermans Park
145 (3 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to Watermans Park, including:

- 34 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed plans to route the track through the park
- 32 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the difference in elevation between the road and park path
- 21 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the use of park for the track
- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the impact on the park
- 12 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the track in the park will not get used
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested improvements to make the park route usable and safe 24/7
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the cycle path would spoil the park aesthetics
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the park cycle route is not needed
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the westbound cycle track is cantilevered over the park to remain level with the road

Segregation
62 (1 per cent) respondents commented on issues about segregation, including:
49 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested segregated cycle tracks, including for Eastbound cyclists (15), the whole route (14), Kew Bridge to Watermans Park (5)

8 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested segregated cycle track in the park

4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the route diverts cyclists from segregated to unsegregated roads

**Route of track**

43 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the route of the track, including:

- 19 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested alternative routes
- 15 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested an alternative route along the A4
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested an alternative route along the riverside

**Current conditions**

39 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on current conditions, including:

- 31 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the road and pavement are too narrow for the proposals
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that current cycling conditions are unnecessary

**Track and access**

26 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the track and access, including:

- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over the lack of access to minor roads from segregated cycle track (including Pump House Crescent, North Road, Holland Gardens, Pottery Road, and Green Dragon Lane)
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested a two-way track is used on the south side of the road
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the reallocation of road space
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the cycle tracks must have smooth and level surfaces
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the reallocation of road space over pavements for cycle tracks
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested maximising cycle track widths

**Impact on motorists**

119 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the impact of the proposals on motorists in the area. 107 of these comments were about congestion and journey times, including:
• 43 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the impact on traffic
• 34 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the current level of congestion
• 15 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would increase congestion
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would slow traffic speeds and increase journey times

Principles of the scheme

64 (1 per cent) respondents commented on the principles of the scheme. These comments have been divided into uptake of the scheme, prioritisation of modes and other.

Uptake of cycling

30 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the uptake of cycling, including:

• 19 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the scheme as it would encourage cycling uptake
• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cycle tracks would be underused

Prioritisation of modes

19 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the prioritisation of modes including 10 respondents who opposed the scheme, considering that changes are not needed to accommodate cyclists.

Other

15 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on other issues about the principles of the scheme, including:

• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents who considered that new developments had not been considered such as at the Marina
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned the scheme does not connect to the cycle network
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the use of cycle routes rather than Cycle Superhighways

Impact on pedestrians
51 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on pedestrians in the area, including:

- 15 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cyclists posed a risk to children by cycling through Watermans Park
- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the scheme will negatively impact pedestrians
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned for children, elderly and disabled people
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the use of continuous pedestrian crossings near Pottery Road

Safety

45 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on safety issues in the area, including:

- 21 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned proposals will decrease safety for all road users, including Watermans Park (13)
- 12 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the cycle track through Waterman’s Park would be unsafe after dark
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would increase the number of accidents
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported the proposals due to safety benefits for all road users

Impact on cyclists

39 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on cyclists in the area, including:

- 11 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the scheme as it will make cycling safer
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that current cycling conditions in the area are inadequate
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about cyclist safety at bus stop and loading bay bypasses
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the scheme as changes will improve the safety of narrow roads around Watermans Park
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over cyclist/ motorist conflict

Impact on bus users

39 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on bus users in the area, including:
- 15 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals will impact bus users in general
- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the relocation of bus stops in the area
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed reinstating the bus lane at Green Dragon Lane to Kew Bridge
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents supported floating bus stops/bus stop bypasses at Kew Bridge Road

Environmental impacts
31 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on environmental impacts in the area, including:
- 12 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals will worsen air quality
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about pollution increasing as a result of congestion
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the proposals as they would reduce pollution

Economic impacts
29 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the economic impacts in the area, including:
- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over the costs of the scheme
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals are a tax on motorists
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the money should be spent elsewhere
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the costs of the scheme should be met by cyclists

Cyclist behaviour
27 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on cyclist behaviour, including:
- 18 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over speeding cyclists, which would pose a danger to pedestrians
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cyclists would not use the cycle track, including 3 specifically mentioning at Waterman’s Park
Junctions
27 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on junctions in the area, including:

- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents supported tightening of the junction at Pottery Road
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents supported new raised entry treatment
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the new signalised crossing

Complementary measures
20 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on complementary measures, including:

- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested improvements to street lighting
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested improvements to public transport (general)
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested improved education and training for cyclists

Impact on churches
14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about cyclist/pedestrian conflict near churches at Watermans Park.

Policy
9 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that cycling legislation should be updated.

Construction impacts
7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over disruption during construction.
Section J: Brentford High Street (West)

(Question 12 "Do you have any comments on the proposals for Brentford High Street (West)?")

464 of the 5,388 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Brentford High Street (West). Percentages are calculated from the overall number of respondents and where above one per cent have been rounded. Only comments that occurred more than twice are included.

General comments are presented first. Other comments have been grouped into the categories below listed in order of how frequently they were mentioned (insert hyperlinks).

General
Impact on motorists
Cycle infrastructure
Principles of the scheme
Impact on pedestrians
Impact on bus users
Impact on cyclists
Junctions
Cyclist behaviour
Environmental impacts
Economic impacts
Complementary measures
Policy
Safety
Construction impacts
General

There were 108 general comments about the proposals for Brentford High Street (West):

- 51 (<1 per cent) respondents made comments out of the scope of the project
- 37 (<1 per cent) respondents made a general comment in support of the scheme such as “great”
- 12 (<1 per cent) respondents made a general comment opposing the scheme such as “bad idea”
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents commented about other sections of the proposed route

Impact on motorists

118 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the impacts on motorists in the area. These comments have been divided into the following categories: congestion and journey times, and road layout.

**Congestion and journey times**

89 (2 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to congestion and journey times, including:

- 50 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would increase congestion, including 14 saying would increase journey times and 3 mentioning Brentford High Street
- 27 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over current levels of congestion
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would have a negative impact on motorists
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned local redevelopment plans would increase congestion

**Road layout**

19 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the road layout, including

- 12 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at the removal of traffic lanes
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested restricting through traffic such as vans and lorries
Cycle infrastructure

103 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the proposed cycle infrastructure in the area. These comments have been divided into the following categories: route of track, crossings and priority, segregation and current conditions.

Route of track

31 (< 1 per cent) respondents commented on the route of the track and suggested links, including:

- 12 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested an alternative route along the A4
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested an alternative route along the riverside
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested extending the cycle track to or over Ealing Road

Crossings and priority

22 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on priority and crossings, including:

- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested there should be a dedicated cyclists signal phase to access Ealing Road
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned using the toucan crossing for cyclists to have northbound access to Ealing Road was inadequate
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested clear cyclist priority across side roads

Segregation

20 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on issues about segregation, including:

- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested segregated cycle tracks
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the westbound cycle track should be fully segregated across Ealing Road

Current conditions

14 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on current conditions, including:

- 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the road and pavement are too narrow for the proposals

Principles of the scheme

60 (1 per cent) respondents commented on the principles of the scheme. These comments have been divided into: prioritisation of modes, uptake of the scheme, and other.
Prioritisation of modes
37 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the prioritisation of modes including:

- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the scheme, considering that changes are not needed to accommodate cyclists
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the scheme should not be implemented at the expense of other modes
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed prioritising other modes
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned there is insufficient space for all road users
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested prioritising public transport

Uptake of cycling
10 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the uptake of cycling, including 7 respondents who were concerned that cycle tracks would be underused.

Other
10 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on other issues about the principles of the scheme, including:

- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned new building developments had not been considered in the scheme
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the scheme be thought through carefully from inception to completion

Impact on pedestrians
34 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on pedestrians in the area, including:

- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the reduction in walking space, 4 of which considered this would cause pedestrian congestion
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned for children, elderly and disabled people
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the scheme will negatively impact pedestrians
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the use of continuous pedestrian crossings near Pottery Road

Impact on bus users
32 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on bus users in the area, including:
• 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals will increase bus journey times
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the removal of bus lanes
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the current length of bus journeys

Impact on cyclists
32 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on cyclists in the area, including:

• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the scheme as it will make cycling safer
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the current cycling route is unsafe or unpleasant to use
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about cyclist safety at bus stop and loading bay bypasses
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposed level of segregation would be ineffective
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the entire route is segregated to ensure cyclist safety
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that only the south side of the area should be used for safety reasons

Junctions
23 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on junctions in the area, including:

• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned for cyclists about the narrow junction at Ealing Road
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested more thought be given to the new road entry treatment at Alexandra Road

Cyclist behaviour
22 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on cyclist behaviour, including:

• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over speeding cyclists, including they pose a danger to pedestrians (4)
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about aggressive cyclists
Environmental impacts
21 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on environmental impacts in the area, including 16 who said they were concerned about pollution increasing as a result of congestion or increased journey times.

Economic impacts
21 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the economic impacts in the area, including:

- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents who were concerned about the economic impacts on shops and businesses on Brentford High Street
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over the costs of the scheme or that it was a waste of money

Complementary measures
13 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on complementary measures, including 7 respondents who said they were concerned about the lack of attention to new developments.

Policy
14 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on policy issues, including:

- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cycling legislation should be updated
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cyclists should be registered
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents supported policies designed to increase cycling uptake

Safety
7 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on safety issues including 4 who said they were concerned the proposals would decrease safety for all road users.

Construction impacts
6 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on construction impacts, including 4 who were concerned over disruption during construction.
Section K: Brentford High Street to Hounslow town centre

(Question 13 “Do you have any comments on future proposals for CS9 from Brentford High Street to Hounslow town centre?”)

1,093 of the 5,388 respondents provided comments on the proposals for the extension of the route to Hounslow town centre. Percentages are calculated from the overall number of respondents and where above one per cent have been rounded. Only comments that occurred more than twice are included.

General comments are presented first. Other comments have been grouped into the categories below listed in order of how frequently they were mentioned (insert hyperlinks).

General

Cycle infrastructure

Principles of the scheme

Impact on motorists

Timescales

Impact on pedestrians

Economic impacts

Impact on cyclists

Environmental impacts

Complementary measures

Safety

Policy

Impact on bus users

Junctions

Construction impacts

Cyclist behaviour

Impact on residents
General

There were 452 general comments about the proposals for the possible extension of the route from Brentford High Street to Hounslow Town Centre:

- 285 (<5 per cent) respondents made a general comment in support of the scheme such as “great”
- 83 (<2 per cent) respondents made a general comment opposing the scheme such as “bad idea”
- 83 (<2 per cent) respondents made comments out of the scope of the project

Cycle infrastructure

377 (7 per cent) respondents commented on the cycle infrastructure in the proposed extension of the route. These comments have been divided into the following categories: suggested links, segregation, route of track, design and current conditions.

Suggested links

226 (4 per cent) respondents suggested links for the route, including Hounslow (44), Heathrow (41), “to other areas of London” (27), “West” (14), “more circular rather than radial links” (12), Kensington and Chelsea (12), Ealing (8), Hyde Park/CS3 (8), Twickenham and London Road (8), Kingston and Richmond Park (7), “East” (6), Syon Park/Lane and Isleworth (3), to the far side of Hounslow town centre instead of the bus station (3)

Segregation

78 (1 per cent) respondents suggested the whole route should be segregated without interruptions.

Route of track

59 (1 per cent) respondents commented on the route of the track, including:

- 27 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested an alternative route along the A4
- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested alternative routes (in general)
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested an alternative route along the riverside
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested putting cycle tracks along quieter roads
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the Cycle Superhighway does not go through busy shopping areas
Design

42 (1 per cent) respondents commented on design management issues, including:

- 28 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the infrastructure is of a high quality design
- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested maximising the width of cycle tracks to minimise crowding
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested constructing with flow over two-way track to reduce conflict

Current conditions

26 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on current conditions, including:

- 18 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the road and pavement are too narrow for the proposals
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about a pinch point at Brentford Canal Bridge
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that current cycle lanes are too narrow

Principles of the scheme

208 (4 per cent) respondents commented on the principles of the scheme. These comments have been divided into: uptake of cycling, cycle network, prioritisation of modes and other.

Uptake of cycling

88 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the uptake of cycling, including:

- 64 (1 per cent) respondents supported the scheme as it would encourage cycling uptake
- 23 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned cycle tracks would be underused

Cycle network

66 (1 per cent) respondents commented on the cycle network, including:

- 53 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the improved cycle links the scheme would provide in West London
- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme doesn’t connect to the wider cycle network

Prioritisation of modes

21 (<2 per cent) respondents commented on the prioritisation of modes including:
• 19 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the scheme, considering that changes are not needed to accommodate cyclists
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested prioritising public transport

Other
33 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on other issues about the principles of the scheme, including:

• 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the scheme is in the wrong location
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the impacts of the scheme have not been fully considered over the entire lifecycle of the project

Impact on motorists
196 (4 per cent) respondents commented on the impacts on motorists. These comments have been divided into the following categories: congestion/journey times and road layout.

Congestion and journey times
167 (3 per cent) respondents commented on issues relating to congestion and journey times:

• 60 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over current levels of congestion
• 55 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would increase congestion
• 17 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the scheme as it would reduce congestion
• 17 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would have a negative impact on motorists
• 15 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would increase journey times for motorists

Road layout
28 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the road layout, including:

• 24 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the current road layout needed improving
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about vehicles parking on the existing cycling infrastructure
Timescales
125 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the timescale for the extension. 121 respondents suggested the scheme is implemented as soon as possible.

Impact on pedestrians
92 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on pedestrians. These have been divided into the following categories: safety, vulnerable groups and other impacts.

Safety
47 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the safety impacts, including:

- 38 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned for pedestrian safety, lack of segregation (11), and speeding cyclists (7)
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the proposals which would improve pedestrian safety

Vulnerable groups
13 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impacts on vulnerable people including:

- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that vulnerable pedestrian groups have not been considered
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the proposal as it increases safety for families with young children

Other Impacts
36 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on impacts including:

- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over the reduction in walking space
- 12 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the needs of pedestrians should be considered
- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the reallocation of footpaths would increase pedestrian congestion
Economic impacts

88 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the economic impacts of the proposed extension of the scheme. These comments have been divided into funding, positive and negative economic impacts.

Funding

64 (1 per cent) respondents commented on funding issues, including:

- 41 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over the costs of the scheme or that it was a waste of money
- 17 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed spending more money on cyclists
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals are a tax on motorists

Positive and negative economic impacts

24 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on positive and negative economic impacts, including:

- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the economic benefits associated with improved accessibility to the area
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the scheme due to positive impacts on the economy
- 5 (<1 per cent) said they were concerned about the economic impacts on local shops and businesses

Impact on cyclists

74 (1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on cyclists in the area, including:

- 32 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the scheme as it will make cycling safer
- 28 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the current conditions for cycling are inadequate
- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested ensuring safety for cyclists at junctions and crossings
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that bus stops may need to be moved because of cycling improvements

Environmental impacts

67 (1 per cent) respondents commented on environmental impacts, including:
• 38 (<1 per cent) respondents supported cycling proposals as a means to cut pollution, 14 of which specifically mentioned the health benefits
• 17 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned pollution will increase as a result of congestion
• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested greening infrastructure including planters along the route (6) and new trees to enhance the public realm (4)

Complementary measures
57 (1 per cent) respondents commented on complementary measures, including:

• 13 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested improving the road network as part of the scheme
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested improving public transport services including bus services (3)
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested increasing cycling parking provision
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested discouraging private car use
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested increased sweeping/maintenance of routes to minimise risk of punctures
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested improved education and training for cyclists
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested measures to take polluting vehicles off the streets
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested traffic calming measures

Safety
48 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on safety issues, including:

• 29 (<1 per cent) respondents supported the proposals due to the safety benefits for all road users
• 18 (<1 per cent) respondents supported safer cycling infrastructure in London
• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals would decrease safety for all road users

Policy
32 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on policy issues, including:

• 14 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cycling legislation should be updated
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cyclists should be insured
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cyclists should be taxed to pay for infrastructure
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents supported policies to increase cycling uptake
Impact on bus users

31 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on bus users in the area, including:

- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the proposals would affect bus users in general
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the loss of bus stops
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the proposals will increase bus journey times

Junctions

21 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on junctions in the area, including:

- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents supported changes to junctions
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents supported cyclist priority through time or space separated junctions

Construction impacts

19 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on construction impacts, including:

- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over construction impacts and disruption
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the benefits of the scheme would be outweighed by the construction impacts

Cyclist behaviour

17 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on cyclist behaviour, including:

- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over lack of awareness by cyclists of other road users
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned cyclists disregard the Highway Code

Impact on residents

10 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact on residents, including:

- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over general negative impacts on residents living nearby
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned over speeding traffic in residential areas
Question 21: Do you have any comments on the quality of this consultation, the materials or the information provided?

950 (18 per cent) respondents answered this question, and the main issues are reported below. Percentages are calculated from the overall number of respondents and where above one per cent have been rounded. Only comments that occurred more than twice are included.

Non specific comments

85 (2 per cent) respondents made general comments about the consultation, including:

- 37 (<1 per cent) respondents made a positive comment about the consultation
- 36 (<1 per cent) respondents made a negative comment about the consultation
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they appreciated being consulted
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that TfL just get on with implementing the scheme and not to consult

Comments on materials

580 (11 per cent) respondents commented on the consultation materials, including:

- 103 (2 per cent) respondents considered that the consultation material was hard to navigate. Concerns included that there was too much information, notably when accessing by a phone, that there should have been links from the questionnaire to the proposals for each section, and there were also suggestions to have a single PDF with all the information
- 102 (2 per cent) respondents considered that the information about the proposals lacked detail
- 89 (2 per cent) respondents considered that the maps, diagrams and drawings could be clearer, or should be larger or that more images were needed
- 68 (1 per cent) respondents considered that the information was good/ very clear or well set out
- 48 (<1 per cent) respondents considered that the diagrams and images were misleading
- 39 (<1 per cent) respondents considered that the information provided about the scheme was biased
- 25 (<1 per cent) respondents considered that the journey time impacts were misleading, inaccurate or not representative of the true impacts
- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that scheme costs and funding sources are made available as part of the proposals
• 14 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that alternative route options should have been available as part of the proposals
• 12 (<1 per cent) respondents considered hard copies should be available for people who do not have a computer or that there was a need for a hard copy booklet containing all the information
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents considered there were too many questions asked
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents considered that the information provided was misleading on the number of trees being removed
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents considered that the resolution of diagrams was poor
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on typo’s in the consultation materials
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the route be shown as an interactive Google Map rather than a PDF
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents considered that the graphics were not colour-blind friendly
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the consultation materials should include a map of local cycle routes
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents queried the need for demographic questions

Comments about the publicity for the proposals
198 (4 per cent) respondents commented on the publicity carried out for the consultation, including:

• 155 (3 per cent) respondents considered that there was insufficient publicity for the scheme and/or that the notification period for the drop-in sessions was too short
• 27 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested there should be more local promotion of the scheme
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they found it difficult to find details about the consultation
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested more information should be available in libraries

Comments about the process
182 (3 per cent) respondents commented on the consultation and engagement process, including:

• 82 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the proposals would be implemented regardless of the consultation
• 72 (1 per cent) respondents considered that the consultation period was too short
• 13 (<1 per cent) respondents considered that there should have been more engagement before the start of the consultation with residents and businesses
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that consultation responses from outside of the area affected should not be considered or given less priority
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents considered that the needs of local interest groups had not been considered
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested there should be more information on how we will respond to the issues raised
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested there should be better engagement with businesses in general

Comments about public events
67 (1 per cent) respondents commented on the drop-in events, including:
• 28 (<1 per cent) respondents made negative comments about the drop-in sessions including that they were poor, or held in cramped venues (for example Chiswick Town Hall and the Cross Keys pub) and/or staff did not take notes of discussions
• 15 (<1 per cent) respondents made positive comments about the drop-in sessions including staff being helpful
• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents considered there should have been more drop-in sessions or public meetings
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents were concerned that the events were led by staff who did not know the areas or the likely impacts
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents made negative comments about the consultation event at Windmill Road, including concern that this was moved at late notice and not publicised

Other comments
63 (1 per cent) respondents made general comments within this consultation question, including 15 (<1 per cent) respondents who made a positive comment about the scheme.

25 (<1 per cent) respondents made other general comments about the scheme.

23 (<1 per cent) respondents made other general comments.