

## **London Cycling Campaign**

**14 March 2016**

### **QW7 Elephant & Castle – Crystal Palace**

This response is made on behalf of the London Cycling Campaign, the capital's leading cycling organisation with more than 12,000 members and 40,000 supporters. We welcome the opportunity to comment on these plans and our response was developed with input from the co-chairs of our Infrastructure Review Group and is in support of the response of Southwark Cyclists, our local group.

We welcome the theory of Quietways targeting less confident cyclists who want to use low-traffic routes, while also providing capacity and maximum route choice for existing cyclists. We also welcome the Mayor's vision for Quietways that are direct, designed as whole routes, segregated from motor traffic where they briefly join busy roads and make use of "filtered permeability" that restricts through motor traffic etc.

Sadly, our assessment based on the first routes to reach public consultation is that Quietways thus far fail to fulfil these ambitions to the degree needed to genuinely boost cycling numbers. In these schemes, we again see some minor positives, but the big issues largely not tackled. So while welcome the much-needed investment and funding in south London to improve cycling, we would seek further discussions with TfL and other stakeholders to consider alternative route options and further improvements to the scheme.

In general, the London Cycling Campaign want, as a condition of funding, all highway development designed to London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS), with a Cycling Level of Service (CLOS) rating of 70 or above, with all "Critical Fails" eliminated. On top of that, we wish to raise the following specific issues:

#### **Calton Avenue**

We support the introduction of a new zebra crossing as part of this scheme, but it appears to offer little to cyclists that isn't already here.

The replacement of traffic islands with pavement build-outs swaps one issue of narrow pinch points which puts those cycling and driving into conflict, with another. Instead, more proper pedestrian crossings, such as zebras, are far preferable – ideally with the crossings on raised tables.

Through traffic looks likely to be one of the main sources of traffic on Calton Avenue. And so an area-wide, cell-based filtered permeability scheme would be worth considering to reduce traffic on Calton Avenue and other sections of this Quietway to genuinely "quiet" levels. Failing that, it's unlikely this scheme, with its very minimal interventions, will enable all-ages, all-abilities cycling – and thus won't dramatically boost cycling numbers.

#### **Dulwich Village junction**

We strongly support the introduction of separate cycle signals and the change of priority at Court Lane to make Calton Avenue's Quietway easier to negotiate to and from. That said, there remain concerns with this design:

1. There appear to be “Critical Fails” via TfL’s Cycling Level of Service (CLOs) matrix with 3.2-4.0m lane widths. This is less of a concern for those arms of the junction that where those cycling are separated, but those cycling along Dulwich Village, in either direction, will be in traffic with this issue.
2. There may be some hook risks of concern also – motor vehicles turning left into Calton from Dulwich Village southbound, for instance.
3. We would also like to see cycle track widths over 1.5m at lights particularly, to ensure a design that will cope with increasing numbers cycling.
4. All turns, including right turns, should be safe, comfortable and convenient for those cycling from all arms of the junction. For instance, how does one turn right from Dulwich Village into Turney Road in such a manner?
5. It would be good to see the southern and northern sides of Dulwich Village treated similarly to the other arms to separate those cycling from motor vehicle traffic.

### **Turney Road**

We welcome increased use of speed humps (as long as they are either raised tables at junctions or sinusoidal, full-road-width humps, not cushions). We also support the introduction of a new zebra crossing as part of this scheme. However, other than these elements, this scheme appears to offer little to cyclists that isn’t already here.

The replacement of traffic islands with pavement build-outs swaps one issue of narrow pinch points which puts those cycling and driving into conflict, with another. Instead, more proper pedestrian crossings, such as zebras, are far preferable – ideally with the crossings on raised tables.

The junction with Burbage Road also does not appear to be designed for those cycling to turn in all directions in comfort, convenience and safety. Further work needs to be done to ensure this junction includes no serious hook risks or “Critical Fail” lane widths (of 3.2-4.0m) via TfL’s Cycling Level of Service (CLOs) matrix.

Through traffic looks likely to be one of the main sources of traffic on Turney Road. And so an area-wide, cell-based filtered permeability scheme would be worth considering to reduce traffic on Turney Road and other sections of this Quietway to genuinely “quiet” levels. Failing that, it’s unlikely this scheme, with its very minimal interventions, will enable all-ages, all-abilities cycling – and thus won’t dramatically boost cycling numbers.

### **Dulwich Wood Avenue/Farquhar**

Southwark Cyclists, our local borough group have already raised the issue of the route alignment between Farquhar Road and Rossendale Road – this is a major issue and means this section will remain a barrier to cycling uptake. We would prefer Southwark Council, TfL, Southwark Cyclists etc. worked together to re-examine the route alignment. But if the route is to stay on Farquhar Road, there are further concerns to raise.

Of greatest concern is the Dulwich Wood Avenue-Gipsy Hill junction: the one-way section is likely to speed up motor vehicle traffic; the design introduces a hook risk at the point cyclists enter the contra-flow lane (where motorists may not be expecting cyclists to go); there appears to be little

done for cyclists entering or exiting Gipsy Hill; there are no speed control measures around the junction.

On top of that, the current design will not satisfactorily make cycling on either Farquhar Road or Dulwich Wood Avenue feel safe, convenient or comfortable – particularly not for all-ages and all abilities. The existing cycle track approaching Crystal Palace Parade is narrow and far below appropriate design specification; removing the centre line will not likely slow or calm vehicles sufficiently; swapping traffic islands for pavement buildouts swaps one pinch point issue for another; and some of the cycle markings look likely to be in the “door zone” for parked cars.

We do welcome provision for increased road humps – but these should be raised tables at junctions or full-width sinusoidal speed humps, not cushions.

Through traffic looks likely to be one of the main sources of traffic on both Dulwich Wood Avenue and Farquhar Road. And so an area-wide, cell-based filtered permeability scheme would be worth considering to reduce traffic on these sections of this Quietway to genuinely “quiet” levels. Alternatively, the removal of parked cars on one side of the roads could free up enough space for segregated cycle track(s) in both directions. Failing such measures, however, it’s unlikely this scheme, with its very minimal interventions and serious flaws, will boost cycling numbers significantly.