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1 Introduction

This section of the report presents the aims and objectives, the study area and an executive summary of key findings.
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1.1 About this study

Background

The Royal Parks have a long history and since being opened to the public have been places for people to walk and enjoy. In the last 15 years the use of the parks for cycling has increased. Over the past six years Transport for London (TfL) has run funding projects to improve cycling and walking – with Cycling on Greenways and LCN+ funding streams. The Royal Parks (TRP) benefited from this funding and delivered a range of projects.

The Broad Walk in The Regent’s Park was opened as a shared use walking and cycling route after two rounds of monitoring. The unsegregated shared use route was trialled for over two years and the decision was made based on the full TRP Criteria for Success and consultation with stakeholders and interest groups.

Groups representing the interests of cyclists in the Park are keen to see the continuation of this route both across St Mark’s Bridge to the north, as well as to the south. The Avenue Gardens would be the most direct link for cyclists to the south from the perspective of the cycle network. The Avenue Gardens are highly ornamental and are sited adjacent to the English Gardens to the east of the Park. TRP consider it is not appropriate to permit cycling along the Avenue Gardens, where large picnics and ball games are currently restricted, due to the formal nature of the Gardens and high number of vulnerable users (including the elderly, very young and those with physical or visual impairments).

Marylebone Green (MG), which lies to the west of Avenue Gardens, is a potential alternative route connecting cyclists to the south of the park. It is the location for the Frieze Art Fair and Taste of London events. It also is used by schools for sports (e.g. hockey) and contains a children’s playground.

TRP is keen to ensure a context specific design process is undertaken to assess the feasibility of opening up MG as a route for cycling whilst engaging with stakeholders and park users to ensure this change is desirable and does not impact adversely on the enjoyment of the park. Based on TRP policy, this process involves a requirement for pre-trial assessment on potential routes. This process is further detailed in The Royal Parks’ Approach to Cycling, issued August 2011.

Project aims

The aim of this study is to deliver robust evidence based recommendations on the feasibility of opening up the existing path in MG to cycling.

The project objectives are:

- To provide evidence based analysis of existing activity and access to the route.
- To provide analysis on the potential demand for the route.
- To consider the CRISP report recommendations.
- To consider design requirements and current uses.
- Evaluate the outcomes of opening of this route to alignment with TRP policy, prior to any decision to trial.

Study area

The focus for this study is the main pedestrian path in MG, and its intersections with Chester Road to the north (Site 1 in Figure 2), and the Outer Circle to the south (Site 2). Data was also collected at other locations in The Regent’s Park, as appropriate. Questionnaire surveys and flow counts have been collected on the Broad Walk (sites 4 and 6), and activity surveys of commuting cyclists were recorded at the intersection of Chester Road with the Outer Circle (Site 5).

For more information about the surveys please see Appendix a on page 47.
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Figure 1 Site 1 - Marylebone Green Gate North on Chester Road

Figure 2 Site 2 - Outer Circle by Marylebone Green Gate South

Figure 3 Site 3 - Intersection of the north-south and east-west paths

Figure 4 Site 4 - Zebra crossing at Broad Walk Gate South

Figure 5 Site 5 - Junction of Chester Road with the Outer Circle

Figure 6 Site 6 - Southern end of Broad Walk
Our approach

An evidence based approach has been used to collect baseline information to assess the potential for permitting cycling on the main pedestrian path in Marylebone Green. As part of this study, an exercise has been completed to understand the likely demand for the route from current users of The Regent’s Park.

On-site data collection, as well as desktop literature review and research, has been used in combination to support this study.

In addition to understanding the likely demand of the route the work undertaken to date has also considered emerging safety issues, the contribution of the route to the cycle network, and the potential cost-benefit for cyclists and pedestrians with necessary interventions and cost estimates.

This report should be seen as a first step in the process of assessing the feasibility of permitting cycling on this path.
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2 Baseline Analysis

This section of the report presents existing activity on the route in context with surrounding area, and users’ perceptions of the area.
2.1 Cyclists, pedestrians and motor vehicles activity

Introduction

Survey methodology

To understand current level of usage and behaviours of users, pedestrian, cyclist and motor vehicle flow surveys were undertaken at five key locations in the area adjacent to the path in MG. Figure 9 to Figure 12 provide some views of the surveyed locations, which are listed below:

- MG north gate, at the junction with Chester Road (Site 1, Figure 9);
- MG south gate, at the junction of the Outer Circle and Park Square West (Site 2, Figure 10);
- MG south gate, just north of the Outer Circle (Site 3, Figure 11);
- Broad Walk south gate, at the junction with Chester Road (Site 4, Figure 12); and
- The junction of Chester Road with the Outer Circle (Site 5).

Weekend flows were recorded on Saturday 2nd June 2012 between 11:00 and 18:00, based on a full on-site video survey. Additional counts were sampled at some locations on Sunday 27th May 2012. Weekday flows were sampled at the same locations as the video survey, between 07:00 and 10:00, on Wednesday 23rd May 2012.

A detailed methodology and survey results are available in the “Appendix” on page 47.
Cyclists activity

Weekend

Cyclist activity in the area follows a typical weekend trend observed in London’s central parks. Activity increases steadily from the morning, up to a peak in the afternoon, typically dependent on the time of year.

The busiest location in the study area is the section of the Outer Circle running south of MG, showing almost 160 cyclists per hour (cph) during the peak hour of 17:00 - 18:00.

Approximately 60 cyclists were recorded on Chester Road by the Broad Walk south gate during the same peak hour. Close to 80 cyclists were observed on the southern end of the Broad Walk, with many continuing their journeys onto the Avenue Gardens, including those dismounting and pushing their bike.

Cyclist activity is very low on MG. The majority of cyclists are choosing journeys along Chester Road, the Inner Circle and the Outer Circle, rather than MG, where cycling is not permitted.

The map in Figure 15 on the next page shows cyclist flows split by direction of travel. This provides more information on which routes cyclists are currently taking. The highest flows (about 100 cyclists) were recorded on the Outer Circle in the eastbound direction. Between 50-60 cyclist were observed going west on the Outer Circle from Park Square West.

Cyclists on Chester Road are split between westbound and eastbound but some demand for continuing journeys from the Broad Walk to the Avenue Gardens was observed.

Figure 13 Weekend cyclist flows (11:00 - 18:00) in cph

Figure 14 Weekend peak cycling flows (17:00 - 18:00) in cph
Figure 15 Weekend peak hour cycling activity (17:00 - 18:00) in cph
**Weekday**

The weekday commuting time period of 7:00 - 10:00 shows considerably higher cyclist flows than those recorded on a weekend, although the flow distribution across the area is comparable.

The peak flows were recorded between 8:00 and 9:00, with close to 400 cph on the Outer Circle by MG south gate and about 100 cph on Chester Road by the Broad Walk south gate (Figure 17).

Very few cyclists were observed off-route within MG. A lower number of cyclists was also recorded in the Avenue Gardens when compared to the weekend, indicating a difference in behaviour from the weekend users.
Pedestrian activity

Weekend

Pedestrians make up for the overwhelming majority of park users during a weekend, with close to 1000 people recorded on the Broad Walk during the peak hour of 17:00 - 18:00.

On Chester Road, 6 times more pedestrians than cyclists were observed at peak times (approximately 340 and 60 respectively).

MG shows considerably lower flows than the Broad Walk, with a peak of 325 people using the south gate during the weekend peak hour (Figure 20).

Between 160 and 220 people were observed on the main north-south path in MG, with the southern end of the Green more popular than the northern end.

Just over 200 people were recorded at the intersection of the north-south and east-west paths in MG south, in both directions.

Weekday

The weekday peak hour is recorded between 8:00 and 9:00. This shows considerably lower pedestrian flows than on a weekend.

The main north-south path in MG is only used by between 30 and 50 people, while the east-west route in the southern end of the Green is more popular amongst pedestrians and joggers, showing close to 280 pedestrians per hour (pph) during the same hour. About twice as many pedestrians were recorded walking east-west on this inner park path than on the adjacent footways along the Outer Circle.
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Figure 18 Weekend pedestrian flows (11:00 - 18:00) in pph

Figure 19 Weekday pedestrian flows (07:00 - 10:00) in pph

Figure 20 Weekend peak pedestrian flows (17:00 - 18:00) in pph

Figure 21 Weekday peak pedestrian flows (08:00 - 09:00) in pph
Motor vehicle activity

A full survey of motor vehicles flows was undertaken for the weekend period based on video footage. On-site sample counts were taken on a weekday on the Outer Circle by MG south gate to provide flow information during commuting times. Motor vehicle speeds were not measured.

To the north of MG, Chester Road offers a connection between the Outer Circle to the east and the Inner Circle. This is a relatively quiet road used predominantly by locals and by park vehicles. Flows during a weekend are low, with about 80 vehicles per hour (vph) between 17:00 and 18:00 (Figure 25).

The junction of the Outer Circle with Park Square West by MG south gate has a more complex layout and shows a higher number of motor vehicles. A traffic island separated the two carriageways, allowing motor vehicles travelling from Park Square West only to turn left onto the Outer Circle. The junction is not signalised and has a dropped kerb for informal pedestrian crossing at its eastern end, as shown in Figure 22.

Motor vehicle flows at this location show very similar patterns during a weekend and a weekday, with the highest flow levels recorded during weekday commuting times (8:00 - 9:00, Figure 24 and Figure 26). Most motor vehicles were observed travelling east-west along the Outer Circle.

Figure 22 Motor vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians at the junction on the Outer Circle outside Marylebone Green South Gate.
Figure 23 Weekend motor vehicle flows (11:00 - 18:00) in vph

Figure 24 Weekday pedestrian flows (07:00 - 10:00) in vph

Figure 25 Weekend motor vehicle flows during the peak hour of pedestrian and cycling activity (17:00 - 18:00) in vph

Figure 26 Weekday peak motor vehicle flows (08:00 - 09:00) in vph
A study of interactions, near-misses and potential conflicts between the different users of MG and the surrounding streets was undertaken during the peak hour of movement on a weekend. This provides an understanding of how users currently interact in the study area, and a benchmark to assess behaviours following the potential formalisation of permitted cycling along the route.

**Key Findings**

No conflicts were recorded along the route, or at its intersections with Chester Road and the Outer Circle.

Some discomfort for pedestrians was observed when cyclists were using the pedestrian paths within MG, especially when entering and exiting the gate on the Outer Circle (Figure 28).

It was observed that the existing dropped kerb on the Outer Circle is not aligned with the pedestrian desire line between MG and Park Square West. This results in pedestrians using the traffic island as a shelter from traffic while crossing the road informally and away from the dropped kerb. This can constitute a potential safety issue with the current junction layout, particularly when groups are involved. An example of this behaviour observed during the peak hour of activity is shown in Figure 29.
2.3 Users’ perceptions

Results

Questionnaire surveys were undertaken at the south gate of the Broad Walk, as part of the demand analysis presented in Chapter 3 on page 23. This offered an opportunity to gather data to understand current cycling activity in the Park.

The full questionnaire form used in the surveys is shown in “Appendix” on page 47.

Responses and success rate

Cyclists were asked to complete questionnaires on site by trained staff along the southern end of the Broad Walk (site 6 shown in Figure 2 on page 7).

In addition to this and following the methodology used in previous assessments for TRP¹, we provided the opportunity for members of the public to respond by post (free of charge), if they did not have time to complete it on site.

The questionnaire surveys were undertaken on both a weekday and a weekend, on different days from the CCTV surveys.

The survey had a high success rate (54%), with many cyclists agreeing to stop and answer questions about their journeys on site. The total number of responses was 128, of which only 8 were postal. A breakdown of responses by type and survey day is shown in Table 1.

Gender and age split

About two thirds of interviewees were male cyclists. Most responses came from people aged between 26 and 35 years.

Users responses

The charts in Figure 31 on page 22 show that approximately 11% of cyclists were using cycle hire bike when interviewed, with similar results on the two survey days.

Compliance with the ‘no cycling’ markings within the park show very different behaviours on the two survey days. A quarter of all cyclists on a weekday admitted making off-route journeys, in line with results from monitoring of The Broad Walk in 2010 (25% and 21% respectively). About half of all cyclists admitted cycling off-route on a weekend.

This useful indication of differences in cyclist behaviours should be taken into account when considering changes in the provision for cyclists in the park.

---

Are you using your own bike or a cycle hire bike?

How frequently do you cycle through this park?

What is your primary purpose for cycling today?

Do you ever cycle on paths in The Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill where cycling is not permitted?

Figure 31 Results of the users’ perceptions survey
This section presents the results of the demand analysis for the proposed route through Marylebone Green.
3.1 Current route choice

The direction of cyclists travelling through the Broad Walk south gate was observed during both a weekend and a weekday. Cyclists using the proposed route through MG are likely to travel to or from the Broad Walk during their journey in The Regent's Park. An indication of directional movement at the south gate of the Broad Walk provides information on the potential re-routing by some cyclists to the proposed path.

**Flows to and from the Broad Walk**

Figure 33 shows the paths taken by cyclists to and from the Broad Walk, during the entire survey periods. The western section of Chester Road towards the Inner Circle was used by 24% and 36% of cyclists travelling southbound on a weekend and weekday respectively. These are the most likely potential users of the proposed link in MG.

The Broad Walk also attracted the majority of cyclists travelling northbound from the western section of Chester Road on both survey days, indicating a preference for cycling within the park by users of the Inner Circle.

**Cyclists in the Avenue Gardens**

The surveys showed a high proportion of cyclists travelling from the Broad Walk continued south on the Avenue Gardens. This includes those dismounting their bikes as required by the “no cycling” instructions on the path surface at this location. For the purposes of this report, such people were considered as cyclists. This confirms the demand for a path that would continue the route from the Broad Walk south through the park, without turning east or west on the road.

However, it should be noted that a much lower number of cyclists was observed in the Avenue Gardens at weekday commuting times, suggesting that this demand is more popular with leisure and occasional users than regular commuters.

**Cycling activity on the Outer Circle**

High proportions of all trips from the Broad Walk continue onto the Outer Circle, which provides a fast north-south cycle link with relatively low motor vehicle traffic.

On-site sampled counts undertaken at the junction of Chester Road with the Outer Circle suggest that cyclists flows are much higher here than at any other location in the study area on both weekends and weekdays (shown in Figure 14 on page 13 and Figure 17 on page 15). Close to 400 CHP were observed here during the weekend peak hour (17:00 - 18:00), with 80% of trip involving no turning at Chester Road. During the weekday peak hour of 8:00 - 9:00, these figures increase to 600 cph and 91% respectively.

These results suggest that the Outer Circle is the most popular cycle route in the study area. The proposed route through MG would provide a slower and more convoluted route which is likely to attract only a small percentage of cyclists from the Outer Circle, especially at weekday commuting times.
Route Demand

Figure 32 The zebra crossing at Broad Walk Gate South

Figure 33 Current direction of cyclists at the Broad Walk Gate South on a weekday (07:00 - 10:00) and a weekend (11:00 - 18:00)

Figure 34 “Off-route” cyclists in the Avenue Gardens
3.2 Route demand

Questionnaire responses

The demand for a potential cycle route through MG was informed by bespoke questionnaire surveys. Cyclists in the Park were asked what route they had taken or were about to take during that journey, and what route they would have taken if the proposed route were also available for cycling. The results are shown in Table 2 and illustrated in Figure 36 and Figure 37.

Overall, only 2% of cyclists used the pedestrians only path in MG, with the majority of interviewees travelling to / from either the Outer Circle or the Inner Circle. This is in line with the flows observed on site and presented above.

When asked what route they would have taken instead, 63% responded that they would have cycled in MG, had this been available for cycling. This suggests the views on the proposed route are positive amongst current users who cycle, with many re-routing their journeys from both the Outer Circle and the Inner Circle.

When asked how often they would use the proposed route, about 20% said they would use it everyday and an additional 40% every week (Figure 35). Weekday users were more keen on using the route than those cycling on a weekend.

When asked whether the new route would be of no benefit, beneficial or extremely beneficial to cyclists, around 56% responded “extremely beneficial”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route they currently take</th>
<th>Route they would take</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route they currently take</th>
<th>Route they would take</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route they currently take</th>
<th>Route they would take</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Comparison of route currently taken and route cyclists would take if the path in Marylebone Green were open to cyclists.
Figure 36  Current routes taken by cyclists

Figure 37  Potential route taken if the proposed route were available for cycling
3.3 MG route in context

The proposed route in context

The map in Figure 38 on page 29 shows the proposed route in MG within the wider cycle network. Roads and paths highlighted in blue indicate routes signed or marked for use by cyclists on a mixture of quiet or busier roads as well as quieter roads that have been recommended by other cyclists, as shown in the “Cycling in central London” maps published by TfL. Green is used to indicate off-road cycle routes, either alongside roads, through parks or along towpaths. This includes the route along the Broad Walk in the Regent’s Park.

The proposed route in MG would support north-south movement through the park and introduce a new connection to the cycle network. This would appeal to people seeking a route requiring a consistent level of ability with The Broad Walk, whilst better connecting them to the wider, strategic cycle network.

The route would provide an additional option for connecting Chester Road to the southern section of the Outer Circle, and Marylebone Road and Portland Place further south through Park Square West. This north-south connection is currently provided by the Inner Circle to the west and the Outer Circle to the east of MG.

The continuation of the MG route to the north is not direct and the link to the Broad Walk is through Chester Road. Further north, the missing cycling link between the Broad Walk and Primrose Hill to the north of the park by St. Mark’s Bridge means that the Outer Circle would still be the most likely used north-south connection in the area.

The broader cycle network in Camden supports north-south connections to the east of the Regent’s Park along Park Village East/Stanhope St and Arlington Rd/Hampstead Rd/Cardington St. To the west of the park, the existing route on Avenue Rd/Outer Circle currently connects Swiss Cottage with Marylebone. Cycle Superhighway CS11 is being planned for implementation in 2015, to make the corridor along Finchley Rd/Park Rd more comfortable, legible and attractive to cyclists.

Estimated route demand

The peak weekday and weekend cyclist flows on the Broad Walk are just under 80 cyclists per hour. The findings of the questionnaire surveys indicate that overall 63% of current cyclists on the Broad Walk would use the proposed route, with similar responses recorded on a weekend and a weekday (64% and 62% respectively). This corresponds to approximately 50 cyclists per hour during the peak hours. As the Broad Walk appeals to leisure cyclists (due to its shared use design) a southern extension such as that which could be provided by Marylebone Green would also be expected to appeal to a similar audience of leisure cyclists.

Further flows could potentially be redirected to MG from the section of the Outer Circle running north-south to the east of the Park (currently avoiding the Broad Walk). However, the Outer Circle provides a more convenient, faster route which is popular among commuting and sports cyclists. The nature of the proposed route through MG makes it an unlikely alternative for such cyclists using the Outer Circle.

Cyclists’ comments on the proposed route

As part of the questionnaire exercise, cyclists were asked to provide comments on the proposed route. A total of 162 individual responses were collected, with some people providing more than one comment.

Most responses indicated the route to be a safer option for cyclists (20%), a more enjoyable (17%) or a more direct route through the park (18%). Many thought that any additional cycle routes would be beneficial (17%) and this would open up the park to cyclists (9%).

Some mentioned the route would encourage more cycling (5%) and few said it would limit the number of cyclists on off-route paths (2%). Others thought the route would not make a big difference (2%).
Figure 38 The proposed route within the existing cycle network around Marylebone Green

Marylebone Green, The Regent's Park
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This section presents recommendations, safety issues, concept proposals and costs associated with the potential implementation of the proposed route.
4.1 Design considerations

An indication of the feasibility of the proposed cycle route through MG has been supported by a review of design implications, implementation costs and safety aspects relating to changes required to address potential conflict and other issues introduced by the opening of the path to cyclists.

This section of the report presents considerations to be taken into account while discussing the feasibility of the proposed route. There will be costs associated with any infrastructural changes considered, e.g. resurfacing, widening gates, maintaining boundary planting, additional signage and markings.

Path width

The existing width is approximately 3m for most of the route, up to 3.8m by the south gate. This can generally be considered sufficient for a proposed shared use route to accommodate the estimated flows of cyclists.

The only other shared use route in The Regent’s Park is over 10m wide, comfortably accommodating cycling and high levels of pedestrian activity. This may set expectations amongst some park users, meaning that any inconsistency between the widths of the existing shared use route and the proposed shared use route in MG may give rise to negative perceptions or experiences of some park users.

There was some damage to the lawn alongside the main path in MG. This behaviour is observed in many parks and can be attributed to personal preference to jog on softer ground. It does not indicate these users require additional path width due to any perceived capacity issues (Figure 40).

Should the decision be made to trial the route, monitoring at early stages should be undertaken to assess flow levels and interactions and inform whether path widening is required.

Path surfacing

The surfacing of the route is in reasonable conditions but should be prioritised to ensure any unevenness and lack of surface texture are remedied as soon as practicable.
Access to the path

There are cobbled stones at the access at MG north gate (Figure 41). These could cause cyclists to slip while turning to enter or exit the gate. Resurfacing would be required at this location to provide a better grip under all weather conditions and to accommodate the new shared use signage and markings to invite cyclists to slow down on approaching the gate.

The gate to the park on the Outer Circle would require a dropped kerb to allow cyclists in and out from the road, as well as the removal of the existing ‘no cycling’ markings. This should be undertaken as part of the redesign of the junction, as described on the next page.

The intersection of the two paths in the northern section of MG would not require improvements, except those relating to the main path discussed in the previous paragraphs.

Intervisibility at the gates

A concern with the current access to MG from Chester Road is the level of intervisibility of all modes before and after the gates, which can be constrained by the presence of planting. This should be addressed by assessing the existing view lines and suggesting mitigations, for example widening of the gate or an increased maintenance of the planting located on both sides of the gates.

The southern gate may need to be redesigned to improve intervisibility between pedestrians and cyclists as they approach the footway on the Outer Circle, as well as to improve the intervisibility between cyclists travelling from the park and motor vehicles on the Outer Circle. This should be considered in the redesign the junction, as described on the next page.

Figure 41 Marylebone Green south gate, looking towards Park Square West

Figure 42 Marylebone Green north gate, from Chester Road
Pedestrian crossing on the Outer Circle

The junction with the outer circle at the north end of Park Square West does not currently cater for north-south cycling traffic and thus work would be required. The existing island enforces a banned right turn and precludes cyclists passing directly into and out of The Regent's Park from Park Square West and Portland Place (Figure 43).

The traffic island would need to be amended to provide a route through and a safe waiting location for cyclists. This would allow cyclists to make the move across the Outer Circle in two stages. As the carriageway is approximately 9.7 metres wide, the island can be widened to provide an effective refuge for cyclists, while still leaving sufficient space each side for east-west vehicles. Motor vehicle flows at this location are about 350 vph during the peak weekend hour (12:00 - 13:00). Bicycles would be provided with two short cycle lanes through the island. The northbound one would lead from the offside of the northbound lane in Park Square West and the southbound one would lead to the southbound side of Park Square West. The north kerb line would have two small ramps to give access for cyclists. The cycle lanes and the ramp could be surface green to give appropriate visual signals to cyclists and pedestrians.

The existing pedestrian crossing can remain and be incorporated into the revised central island. However, the redesign of the traffic island provides an opportunity to support pedestrian desire line between the south gate and Park Square West, and to reduce the number of pedestrians using the island to shelter from traffic away from the existing dropped kerb crossing facility, as observed in the video footage collected at this location and discussed in “2.2 Interactions study” on page 20, and shown indicatively in Figure 44.

Any changes to the layout of this junction must accommodate the needs of all users, including considerations on the use of the junction by public vehicles and maintenance vehicles, conflict between pedestrians crossing the road and motor vehicles, and potential conflict between cyclists through MG south gate and motor vehicles on the Outer Circle. Existing vehicle speeds should be monitored for any potential issues, and cyclist visibility particularly at dusk should be reviewed.
Compliance

The shared use nature of the proposed route would require pedestrian priority at all locations. Appropriate surfacing and markings would be recommended to reinforce this message at key locations - the gates and at intersections along the main path.

Cyclists on the main north-south path increase the risk of conflicts with pedestrians and joggers especially those at the intersection of the paths (e.g. Figure 46). The low number of cyclists and pedestrians estimated and the high intervisibility at this location should ensure a minimum level of risk. However, interactions should be monitored during the trial period and after the implementation of the route to identify and minimise safety issues at early stages.

Playground

The existing access to the Playground is via a gate adjacent to the main path. The visibility of the gate coming from the south is obstructed by some mature planting. The opening of the path to cyclists would create a conflict between children and adults entering and exiting the Playground at this location and cyclists on the main path. Groups of parents and children, some with bicycles and some without, also congregate outside this gate.

This conflict can be reduced by redesigning the gates and removing/changing the planting, to provide better intervisibility between modes at this location and more space between the gates and the proposed shared use path. Alternatively, this gate could be closed and the gate located at the southern end of the Playground, which is currently locked, could be opened and used instead. The latter measure would also prevent issues associated with the proposed improvement works of the toilet facilities and kiosks.

A study of interactions should be undertaken during the trial period and after the implementation of the route to identify and minimise safety issues at an early stage.
Closure of MG during events

MG is the location for the Frieze Art Fair and Taste of London events, during which the area is closed off and only accessible by paying visitors to the events. There is a risk that cyclists using the proposed route on a daily basis would continue to cycle through the park off-route (e.g. through the Avenue Gardens), at times when the MG route is not available. Also of relevance is the impact on cyclists of queuing traffic, and taxi loading/unloading on the Outer Circle during these events.

Other considerations

Refurbishment of toilets and kiosks

As part of an overall review of toilet facilities within the Royal Parks, the Agency is reviewing proposals for the refurbishment of the existing toilet facilities within the MG Playground. In addition, proposals for the replacement of the temporary kiosk with a permanent facility on the Playground boundary are being considered. The projects are likely to develop over the next couple of years and should be considered when making the decision on whether to trial the proposed MG route.

Sport events

The Green is also currently used by schools for sports, mostly hockey, throughout the year.
4.2 Design Priorities

In the previous section a range of potential issues and mitigation measures has been identified in Marylebone Green should cycling be accommodated.

Some of these measures will need to be implemented before any trial of cycling were to take place. Such measures will enable cycling along the route so that a trial can take place and the suitability of the route for shared use can be evaluated effectively. These measures are recommended in the table below as having a higher priority for implementation.

The need and desirability of the remaining measures can be evaluated as part of the trial itself. These are indicated in the table below as having a lower priority for implementation.

The need for each measure can be further considered in developing and designing a suitable trial.

The location column refers to the map in Figure 39 on page 32.

### Proposed Shared Use Route - Design Priorities for Pre-trial implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity/Element</th>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Risk for</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Suggested Measure or Design Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Paving at gate</td>
<td>Slippery surface</td>
<td>Cyclists</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Resurfacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervisibility at gate</td>
<td>Potential Conflict</td>
<td>All park users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Amendments to planting located on both sides of the gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Potential Conflict</td>
<td>All park users</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Context sensitive surface markings indicating where cycling is and is not allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Main path</td>
<td>Insufficient width</td>
<td>All park users</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Monitoring of cyclists flows and interactions during trial period to inform need to widen the path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main path</td>
<td>Poor surface</td>
<td>All park users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Resurfacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Playground gate</td>
<td>Potential Conflict</td>
<td>All park users</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Closure or redesign of gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Paths intersection</td>
<td>Potential Conflict</td>
<td>All park users</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Resurfacing and markings to reinforce the pedestrian priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vehicle speeds</td>
<td>Potential Conflict</td>
<td>Cyclists</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Ensure appropriate vehicle speeds and behaviour along the Outer Circle (e.g. Enforcement). Improve visibility of cyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervisibility at gate</td>
<td>Potential Conflict</td>
<td>All park users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Amendments to planting located on both sides of the gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Footway</td>
<td>Not suitable</td>
<td>Cyclists</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Dropped kerbs and resurfacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Traffic island</td>
<td>Not suitable</td>
<td>Cyclists / vehicles</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Redesign of traffic island</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Design Priorities for Pre-trial Implementation
4.3 Estimated Costs

The cost to implement each measure has been estimated, and these are shown individually in the table below.

Some of these measures will need to be implemented prior to a trial as some of them are critical to facilitate a cycling route. For measures that are not critical, the suitability of each, and their associated costs, can be assessed during the trial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity/Element</th>
<th>Potential Action</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Paving at gate</td>
<td>Resurfacing at gate.</td>
<td>£10K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Intervisibility at gate</td>
<td>Amendments to planting located on both sides of the gate.</td>
<td>£0.5K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>'No cycling / no skating' markings at entrance to diagonal path.</td>
<td>£0.5K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Main path</td>
<td>Resurfacing.</td>
<td>£40K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Main path</td>
<td>Monitoring of cyclists flows and interactions during trial period to inform need to widen the path.</td>
<td>£5-10K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Main path</td>
<td>Pathway widening.</td>
<td>£50k (widen by 1m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Main path</td>
<td>Pathway widening.</td>
<td>£80k (widen by 2m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Playground gate</td>
<td>Closure of gate (and opening of alternative gate currently locked).</td>
<td>£1K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Playground gate</td>
<td>Redesign of gate.</td>
<td>£10K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Paths intersection</td>
<td>Resurfacing and markings to reinforce the pedestrian priority.</td>
<td>£0.5K (resurfacing included in Main Path)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Intervisibility at gate</td>
<td>Amendments to planting located on both sides of the gate.</td>
<td>£0.5K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Footway</td>
<td>Dropped kerb and resurfacing at gate.</td>
<td>£7K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Traffic island</td>
<td>Redesign of traffic island.</td>
<td>£15-25K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Estimated costs of potential measures
This section presents a summary of findings and recommendations.
5.1 Summary of Findings

Existing Behaviour

Activity

Pedestrian and cycling activity in the study area peaks between 08:00 and 09:00 on a weekday and during the afternoon on a weekend. Very few cyclists currently use the path in Marylebone Green (MG), where cycling is not permitted. Some cycling activity was observed in the Avenue Gardens, especially at weekends.

During the weekend peak hour around 50 cyclists were observed on Chester Road adjacent to the northern gate to MG, and this increased to about 100 cyclists during the weekday peak hour. To the south of MG, cyclist flows on the Outer Circle are higher, with 150 and 400 cyclists per hour during peak periods of the weekend and weekdays respectively.

Over 300 pedestrians were counted during the weekend peak hour on the southern end of MG, with flows decreasing to about 250 pedestrians per hour (pph) along the path, by the intersection with the east-west path and to 160 pph at the northern end of the Green. Fewer pedestrians were observed on the main north-south path during the weekday peak hour (120 pph by the south gate and 30 by the north gate).

Chester Road is used by approximately 80 motor vehicles during the weekend peak hour. The section of the Outer Circle adjacent to MG has higher flows, with around 300 and 500 motor vehicles during the weekend and weekday peak hours respectively.

Interactions

The study highlighted only minor issues with circulation and potential conflict between different users and visitors in the study area. These are illustrated on the key issues map in Figure 51 alongside and briefly described below:

- The interactions study identified no conflict between modes during the weekend peak hour of pedestrian and cycling activity. Very few cyclists were observed on the main path in MG during the peak hours of activity.
- Pedestrians were observed standing on the central reserve away from the crossing facility, whilst waiting to cross over the Outer Circle adjacent to MG. This suggests that the crossing facility does not currently align with pedestrian desire lines over the Outer Circle.
- There was some damage to the lawn alongside the main path in MG, suggesting pedestrians or joggers use more than the existing width of the path. This behaviour is observed in many parks and can be attributed to personal preference to jog on softer ground. It does not indicate these users require additional path width due to any perceived capacity issues.

Overall, the evidence suggests that the route through MG currently addresses the needs of all permitted users, though there are opportunities to improve its conditions to benefit all users, such as realigning the pedestrian crossing to the south of MG.

Any changes to the permissions for cycling within the area, and associated changes to the layouts of junctions and any resurfacing work, should accommodate an equivalent level of comfort as currently observed.

The map in Figure 51 shows a summary of key issues with the existing site.
100 cyclists per hour at peak times on a weekday. 50 cph at peak times at the weekend

Very low cycling activity observed (currently prohibited)

Low trafficked route with 300pph at peak times at weekend and 30pph at peak times on weekday

Busy pedestrian route at weekends (1000pph) and at weekdays (500pph)

Damage to the lawn alongside the path.

Pedestrian crossing facility not aligned to desire lines. Park users make use of central refuge to help cross the road

Key route for existing commuting and utility cyclists

Key route for existing commuting and utility cyclists

Marylebone Green, The Regent's Park

Figure S1 Existing Key issues
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Key Issues for Proposed Route

This report provides evidence to inform a decision to trial the route in Marylebone Green for shared use. The following section summarises key issues relating to this evidence.

An additional local cycle connection

In undertaking this study it is assumed that there will be some benefits in introducing a new shared use route in MG. This route would provide an additional connection to the local cycle network to and from the Broad Walk, and provide a continuation of a pleasant, safe and attractive route through the Regent’s Park with a consistent level of cycling ability.

Analysis suggests such benefits would contribute to demand for the route in MG. Of those who currently cycle along the Broad Walk, 63% of respondents declared they would use the proposed route if it were available for cycling. This corresponds to approximately 50 cyclists per hour at peak times. The findings suggest that MG would be used by these cyclists instead of less attractive alternatives on the road network.

Limited benefits to the strategic cycle network

The benefits of the new route in the strategic cycle network are more limited. Connections to the south of the park are already provided by the nearby routes along the Outer Circle and the Inner Circle, east and west of MG respectively.

The proposed route does not align with the Broad Walk and it would not be directly visible from that route. Anecdotal evidence suggests commuters currently cycle on the Outer Circle in much greater numbers, as this provides a more direct and faster north-south connection between Camden/Primrose Hill and Westminster, rather than The Broad Walk.

To the south, MG would provide a direct link towards Portland Place through Park Square West, although this is already supported by the Outer Circle. To the north of the park, the missing cycling link between the Broad Walk and Primrose Hill by St. Mark’s Bridge means that the Outer Circle would remain the most likely used north-south connection in the area.

Design improvements required and recommended

The analysis presented in this report suggests that the introduction of a shared use route in MG would require a number of infrastructure upgrades, including the redesign of the junction at the southern end of the route where the path intersects with the Outer Circle. Other less critical physical measures have been identified such as path widening and improvements to intervisibility, for further consideration.

Consider the impact on all park users

MG is currently well used by joggers and pedestrians, and provides a quieter area within the Regent’s Park often used for informal sport events and other gatherings.

Introducing a shared use route in MG is likely to increase interactions with pedestrians, especially more vulnerable users.

Closure of the path during temporary events

MG is not accessible during the Frieze Art Fair and Taste of London events. There is a risk that cyclists on a daily basis would continue to cycle through the park off-route (e.g. through the Avenue Gardens), at times when the MG route is not available.

Decision to trial the proposed route

Overall, the scope of this report did not find any evidence to suggest a trial cannot take place. This report identified a series of infrastructure changes required to allow cycling on the route. The estimated cost of these changes will be at least £33,500.

The benefit of this trial should be evaluated by The Royal Parks Agency against their policies and priorities. It is the decision of The Royal Parks Agency (TRP) whether to open up this route to cycling to allow a trial to take place.
5.2 Requirements for a Trial

Should the decision be made to open up this route to trial cycling, this review has identified a range of measures that would be either required or recommended to accommodate cycling. These measures seek to enable connections to and from the route for cyclists, improve conditions along the route, and optimise the environment for the comfort of all users. The cost for each of these measures has been estimated and shown previously in this report.

Pre-trial Requirements

Should the decision be made to open up this route to trial cycling, it may not be desirable to implement all measures which have been identified in this report (without further testing to understand the need for them). However, some of these measures will be critical to have in place if a cycling trial takes place. Critical measures would allow a realistic trial to take place so that the suitability of the route for shared use can be evaluated effectively. These critical measures are shown in red in Figure 43. If the decision is made to go to trial these measures would:

- Provide information to users and visitors of where cycling would and would not be permitted, by providing context sensitive signs and surface markings.
- Enable route continuity and access for bicycles, by providing dropped kerbs.
- Redesign the traffic island and signalling at the junction with Outer Circle to facilitate bicycle access to Marylebone Green.
- Improve slip resistance at access points into MG by resurfacing.
- Reduce hazards relating to the playground adjacent to the route in MG, by either restricting access to the playground at this location and reopening the alternative gate to the playground, or redesigning the gate currently in operation.

Further Recommendations

If the decision is made to go to trial, there are several other measures that should be considered to optimise comfort along the route. These are indicated in Figure 43 as having a medium or lower priority for implementation. The need and desirability of these measures could be evaluated as part of any trial. These include potential measures to:

- Improve intervisibility at access points into MG at the north and south, potentially by removing and redesigning of planting.
- Minimise the hazards for pedestrians and cyclists related to vehicles at the junction of MG and the Outer Circle, by enforcement or other measures.
- Improve suitability of cycling and shared use along the route by a combination of resurfacing or path widening.
**Intervisibility at gate could be an issue for cyclists and other park users**

- Improve intervisibility at the gate

**Slippery paving surface.**

- Resurfacing

**Path width may be insufficient**

- Increase width of path

**Surface suitability for cycling**

- Resurface length of path

**Likely increase in conflict at intersection**

- Resurfacing, markings and monitoring

**Motorised vehicle speed and behaviour may introduce hazard at junction for cyclists and pedestrians**

- Enforcement and improve intervisibility

**Interintersection of cycling route with playground is likely to introduce some conflict with vulnerable users**

- Redesign or close the gate to the Playground

**Footway not suitable for continuous cycling route**

- Install dropped kerb and resurface

**Awareness of pedestrian priority and compliance with cycling route**

- Install context sensitive signs and/or surface markings indicating where cycling is and is not allowed (along length of path)

**Likely increase in conflict at intersection**

- Resurfacing, markings and monitoring

**Slippery paving surface.**

- Resurfacing

**Existing junction layout not suitable for north-south cycling**

- Redesign the junction with amendments to the traffic island

**Intervisibility at gate could be an issue for cyclists and other park users**

- Improve intervisibility at the gate

**Slippery paving surface**

- Resurfacing

Figure 52 Recommended improvement measures
5.3 Next Steps

This report identifies a series of infrastructure changes required if the decision is made to trial cycling along this route. The estimated cost of these changes will be at least £33,500.

The benefit of this trial should be evaluated by The Royal Parks Agency against their policies and priorities.

It is the decision of The Royal Parks Agency (TRP) whether to open up this route to cycling to allow a trial to take place. Findings and recommendations presented in this report will inform this decision following discussions with relevant stakeholders. To support this discussion an initial risks register has been produced to summarise key risks when considering whether to carry out a trial of shared use.

Should the decision be made to go to trial, the design process should be further developed to support the recommendations in this report, and identify any additional issues emerging from future phases of work. Monitoring and evaluation work should be carried out at all stages of any planning and implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marylebone Green is shut a few times every year for special events. Any shared use route in MG would be shut to pedestrians and cyclists at these times</td>
<td>Consider signing an alternative route for pedestrians and cyclists when Marylebone Green is closed. Consider implications of negative comments and feedback from users when route is closed.</td>
<td>TRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Undertaking a trial of shared use identifies the need for physical mitigation measures other than those identified as being critical in pre-trial feasibility.</td>
<td>Safeguard budgets for implementing any mitigation measures identified during the trial, e.g. potential resurfacing or path widening.</td>
<td>TRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Impact on vehicle traffic and movements on the Outer Circle and surrounding network (as a result of a traffic island redesign) is significant.</td>
<td>Further develop traffic island redesign in next stage of design and reassess any risks.</td>
<td>TRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Compliance with cycling restrictions in the park reduces, (or is perceived to get worse), reducing level of actual or perceived considerate behaviour in the park.</td>
<td>Ensure clear (and context sensitive) signing indicating where cycling is and is not permitted. Monitor and evaluate any changes to non-compliance.</td>
<td>TRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Intersection of cycling route with playground may introduce conflict with vulnerable users</td>
<td>To be assessed in next stage / during trial.</td>
<td>TRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>Intervisibility at connections of Marylebone Green to Chester Road and the Outer Circle could introduce hazards for cyclists and pedestrians.</td>
<td>To be assessed in next stage / during trial.</td>
<td>TRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>Path width may be insufficient for larger flows of cyclists and pedestrians.</td>
<td>To be assessed in next stage / during trial.</td>
<td>TRP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marylebone Green Route
Appendix

This sections present details on the on-site flow and questionnaires surveys.
Flow surveys

Methodology

The findings presented in this report are based on data collected using video surveys and manual counts. Cameras were placed at four different locations in The Regent’s Park.

The footage was recorded over three days. A breakdown of survey details is shown below.

WEEKDAY SURVEY
- Date: 23 May 2012 - Wednesday
- Times: 07:00-10:00
- Survey locations: sites 1 to 5
- Frequency: 10 minutes every hour
- Weather: Sunny / partly cloudy
- Method: on-site sampled counts

WEEKEND SURVEYS
- Date: 2 June 2012 - Saturday
- Times: 11:00-18:00
- Survey locations: sites 1, 2, 3 and 4
- Frequency: Full Period Continuous
- Weather: Cloudy
- Method: CCTV footage

- Date: 27 May 2012 - Sunday
- Times: 11:00-18:00
- Survey locations: sites 4 and 5
- Frequency: 10 minutes every hour
- Weather: Sunny and mild
- Method: on-site sampled counts

Questionnaire surveys

Methodology

Cyclists were asked to complete questionnaires on site by trained staff along The Regent’s Park Broad Walk, by Broad Walk South Gate. In addition, we provided the opportunity for cyclists to take a questionnaire home and post it back free of charge, if they did not have the time to complete it on-site.

Figure 55 and Figure 56 show the questionnaire that was used. A total of 128 responses were collected, as shown in Table 5 below.

WEEKDAY SURVEY
- Date: 23 May 2012 - Wednesday
- Times: 07:00-10:00
- Survey location: Broad Walk South Gate (site 6)
- Frequency: Full Period
- Weather: Sunny / partly cloudy
- Method: on-site questionnaires and distribution of postal forms

WEEKEND SURVEY
- Date: 27 May 2012 - Sunday
- Times: 11:00-18:00
- Survey location: Broad Walk Gate South (site 6)
- Frequency: Full Period
- Weather: Sunny and mild
- Method: on-site questionnaires and distribution of postal forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Date</th>
<th>Response Type</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wed 23rd May 2012</td>
<td>On-site</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 23rd May 2012</td>
<td>Postal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun 27th May 2012</td>
<td>On-site</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun 27th May 2012</td>
<td>Postal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total responses 128

Table 5 Questionnaire responses
Figure 54 Study area and survey locations

Marylebone Green, The Regent's Park

- Site 1
- Site 2
- Site 3
- Site 4
- Site 5
- Site 6

PROPOSED ROUTE

Thank you very much for taking this questionnaire. It should take no longer than five minutes to complete. This survey is being carried out by Atkins on behalf of The Royal Parks.

Atkins are investigating current activity, demand and opinions of users towards a potential new cycle route through Marylebone Green, The Regent’s Park.

We would be grateful if you could fill out the attached questionnaire regarding your journey in the park. Please return the questionnaire to Atkins within two weeks using the postage-paid addressed envelope provided.

If you have any specific queries about this questionnaire, or would prefer a copy in large print, please contact our team on 0207 121 2551 or email us at giorgio.salani@atkinsglobal.com. If you have any general queries about this survey, please contact The Royal Parks at cycle@royalparks.gsi.gov.uk.

Thanks again for sharing your views with us.
Marylebone Green Route Proposal, The Regent’s Park
Questionnaire - 27/05/2012

Thank you very much for taking a questionnaire. It should take no longer than a few minutes to complete.

1. What was the time of your visit when given this Survey?
2. We would like to know some information about your journey in the park.
3. You are using your own or a cycle hire bike?
4. How frequently do you cycle through this park?
5. In which seasons do you cycle in this park?
6. What was your primary purpose for cycling?
7. How long was your primary purpose for cycling?
8. Do you ever cycle on paths in The Regent’s Park and Primrose Hill where cycling is not permitted?
9. What was your direction of travel on that journey?
10. Please mark your route on the map below:

Figure 56 Example Questionnaire (postal), page 2