

Southbury Road

11 December 2015

<http://cycleenfield.co.uk/have-your-say/southbury-road-scheme-consultation/>

Do you support the overall proposals for the Southbury Road scheme?

Partially

The London Cycling Campaign is the capital's leading cycling organisation with more than 12,000 members and 40,000 supporters. We welcome the opportunity to comment on these plans and our response has been developed in partnership with the chairs of our Infrastructure Review Group and the local Enfield Cycling Campaign.

This scheme will provide a route into Enfield Town from the east to link with the redesigned Town centre making travelling to Enfield Town centre by bicycle a safer and more attractive option. It will also provide a vital part of the network of cycle routes across the borough allowing more choice in transport mode for more journeys and helping to reduce pollution and combat poor health in the borough.

The scheme offers substantial amounts of protected space for cycling, and improved junctions. However, we feel it doesn't go far enough in key areas. Of particular concern are several junctions where either hook risks are not eliminated, or where approaches that are likely to severely disadvantage cyclists are proposed (such as "Cycle Gates" at ASLs or "two-stage rights"). The result will likely not feel safe enough for less confident cyclists to negotiate – thus risking limiting potential usage.

The result of the use of lower quality junction treatments and tracks could be a reputational risk to Enfield. Firstly, these issues mean significant barriers to less confident and newer cyclists remain, that could see Enfield missing its modal share targets. Secondly, junction designs that introduce long waits (two-stage rights, for instance) are seeing lower levels of compliance by current cyclists when introduced elsewhere in London. Which will risk failing to demonstrate to non-cycling residents the benefits of the scheme.

Finally, and in general, the London Cycling Campaign would like to see all schemes given a CLoS rating (as well as adhering to the latest London Cycle Design Standards) that demonstrates significant improvement from the current layout will be achieved for cycling, and that eliminates all "critical fails" in any proposed design before being funded for construction, let alone public consultation.

Do you support the overall proposals for this section from Enfield Town to Ladysmith Road?

Partially

The bus stop by River Front is far too busy for a "boarder" treatment, that will lead to conflict between cyclists and pedestrians waiting to board the bus or getting on and off one. Bus stop boarders should only be used in locations where the bus stop is not heavily used.

The “cycle gate” facilities proposed at the Willow Walk junction heavily disadvantage cyclists and will cause cycle tailbacks if the route becomes popular, likely resulting in widespread rule-breaking and risk-taking among many faster cyclists. At the same time, two-stage right implementations so far in London have added disproportionate wait times to cyclists using junctions – and again have seen some cyclists ignoring the facility and taking risks due to the extremely long wait times they would otherwise be subject to.

Both of these issues might be acceptable if the junction was well designed enough for less confident cyclists, who would then outnumber in the long-term, current cyclists. But that is not the case. Cyclists going ahead or turning right out of Tesco's, for instance, will still be subject to hostile road conditions and hook risks.

The junction design also on one hand disadvantages pedestrians with two-stage crossings (and no crossing on the east side of the junction), while simultaneously providing large pedestrian islands that could instead be used to create “cycle separated junction” or “hold the left” designs to further improve cycling safety and convenience.

On a general point, many of the cycle tracks are under 2m, some also have semi-segregated measures inside that width. As per London Cycle Design Standards, these widths are far from optimal. Reducing the ability for cyclists at different speeds to overtake each other reduces the effectiveness of these tracks for a broad audience of all ages, all abilities cyclists.

Finally, more could be done with side roads such as Ladysmith Road to ensure vehicle speeds entering and exiting are low – a raised table, modal filter or “Copenhagen” or “blended” crossing, for instance.

Do you support the overall proposals for this section from Stanley Road to Mafeking Road?

Partially

Is there a buffer zone between pavement parking and cycle tracks? It should be ideally 1m.

See earlier comments on the need to slow vehicles entering/exiting side roads, cycle track widths and bus stop boarders.

Finally, how are cyclists riding eastbound meant to access the Bush Hill Park Greenway? Presumably the crossing should be upgraded to become a “toucan” crossing with a “jug handle” turn onto the pavement with dropped kerb so that cyclists can access the park?

Do you support the overall proposals for this section from Clydach Road to Southbury Avenue?

Partially

How are cyclists riding westbound meant to access the Clydach Road Greenway?

See earlier comments on the need to slow vehicles entering/exiting side roads, cycle track widths, bus stop boarders and delays introduced by “two stage right” designs.

The present design only appears to offer “two stage right” facilities for cyclists turning from westbound to northbound. And there appears to be no facility for cyclists to head south into Clive

Road. This means that the junction will remain a barrier in some directions, particularly to less confident cyclists. On top of that, pedestrians appear to be disadvantaged again with two-stage crossings on some arms and no crossing to the west at all.

Do you support the overall proposals for this section from Southbury Avenue to Baird Road?

Partially

The three stages required for northbound or southbound cyclists (and pedestrians) to cross Southbury Road will add excessive waiting time to any such journey at the A10 Cambridge Road junction.

See earlier comments on the need to slow vehicles entering/exiting side roads, cycle track widths, bus stop boarders and delays introduced by “two stage right” designs.

Do you support the overall proposals for this section from Baird Road to Kingsway?

Partially

The wide, flared entrance and exits at Crown Road, combined with left hook risks for eastbound cyclists and no right turn facility for cyclists going westbound, mean this junction design will feel hostile to less confident cyclists and may represent a safety concern, depending on the number of cyclist and vehicle turning movements through it.

See earlier comments on the need to slow vehicles entering/exiting side roads, cycle track widths and bus stop boarders.

Do you support the overall proposals for this section from Aberdare Road to Ponders End?

Partially

There appears to be space for a two-stage right turn westbound into Swansea Road, but no provision. And no provision for cyclists to enter Swansea Road either. Again, this represents a potential barrier to less confident cyclists who will be forced to detour around.

Just further east, there is no facility for cyclists to turn right into Glyn Road.

See earlier comments on the need to slow vehicles entering/exiting side roads, cycle track widths and bus stop boarders.

Do you support the overall proposals for this section from Colmore Road to Alexandra Road?

No

The current proposal severely disadvantages westbound cyclists. It is likely therefore that current and confident cyclists will remain in a now-narrowed carriageway.

See earlier comments on the need to slow vehicles entering/exiting side roads, cycle track widths and bus stop boarders.

Do you support the overall proposals for this section, Alexandra Road / Alma Road?

Partially

How will westbound cyclists access the Alexandra Road Greenway, given they've been routed away from the A110?

Far more serious, the plans say "cyclists give way to traffic entering Scotland Green Road" which implies there will be lights phasing that sees ahead and left-turning westbound cyclists moving at the same time as left-turning westbound traffic . This introduces a significant hook risk.

The crossing for eastbound cyclists to the two-way track also needs to be made as simple and easy to use as possible to ensure maximum compliance – otherwise the current design risks significant numbers of cyclists re-entering the carriageway at this point. That means both softening the tightness of the turns currently designed for cyclists and ensuring wait times are as short as possible.

See earlier comments on the need to slow vehicles entering/exiting side roads, cycle track widths and bus stop boarders.

Do you support the overall proposals for this section, Alma Road / Lea Valley Navigation?

No

The track (that already runs) into the subway is narrow, with tight bends. The result is many current confident cyclists ignore it – and will likely continue to ignore it. Even with improved lighting, it's also likely many less confident cyclists will be wary of using a subway in such an isolated spot. As a result, this section remains a significant barrier to cycling the route.

Do you support the overall proposals for this section, River Lea Navigation / King Georges Reservoir?

Yes

See earlier comments on the need to slow vehicles entering/exiting side roads (Wharf Road).

Do you support the overall proposals for this section, King Georges Reservoir to Waltham Forest – West?

Yes

Obviously, this scheme, and therefore our support for it, hinges on acquisition of land.

Do you support the proposals for this section, King Georges Reservoir to Waltham Forest - Middle?

Yes

See earlier comments on the need to slow vehicles entering/exiting side roads and access to sites. The track here should have priority over access, not the other way round.

Obviously, this scheme, and therefore our support for it, hinges on acquisition of land.

Do you support the overall proposals for this section, King Georges Reservoir to Waltham Forest - East?

Yes

See earlier comments on the need to slow vehicles entering/exiting side roads and access to sites. The track here should have priority over access, not the other way round.

Obviously, this scheme, and therefore our support for it, hinges on acquisition of land, as well as ensuring continuation into Waltham Forest appropriately.