

London Cycling Campaign

8 August 2016

Richmond upon Thames Ham & Petersham Village and Teddington Village Quietway

https://consultation.richmond.gov.uk/environment/quietway/consult_view

This response is made on behalf of the London Cycling Campaign (LCC), the capital's leading cycling organisation with more than 12,000 members and 40,000 supporters.

LCC welcomes the opportunity to comment on these plans and its response was developed with input from its Infrastructure Review Group and in support of the response from its borough group Richmond Cyclists.

LCC wants, as a condition of funding, all highway development designed to London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS), with all "Critical Fails" eliminated from the scheme's Cycling Level of Service assessment (CLOS). It also expects all QuietWays schemes to be of comparable quality to similar schemes in cities with a high modal share of cycling, i.e. with a CLOS rating of 70 or above.

LCC notes a more efficient use of road space is to allocate it to cycling and walking in preference to private motor vehicles, particularly for journeys of 5km or less. LCC expects schemes to be designed to allocate road space for growth in cycling, to accommodate such journeys.

LCC welcomes 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. It also welcomes the 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.

LCC considers that these proposals fail to fulfil the Quietways programme requirements to the degree needed to genuinely boost cycling numbers. In this scheme, as in too many Quietway schemes, there are some minor positives, but the big issues remain largely not tackled. LCC has previously commented on Quietways schemes from across London. The latter stages of this scheme represents some of the worst and busiest bits of Quietway seen yet, with the lowest proposed level of interventions.

Therefore LCC cannot support this scheme as currently designed as it is unlikely to enable many more and/or a wider range of people to cycle than currently do along this route and in the area – which is also explicitly against the stated aims of the Quietway programme.

Specifically LCC also makes the following points:

- **Ham Gate Avenue** – this path should to be very wide to cope with expected volumes of both pedestrians and people cycling. LCDS would suggest that for medium flows of people cycling and pedestrians, a shared use path should be a minimum of 3m, ideal would likely be a partially separated path at 4.5m.
- **Petersham Road/Ham Gate Avenue junction** – Petersham Road is a busy road, with nearly 14,000 vehicles including over 300 HGVs daily (DfT traffic counts, 2015). 200 people cycling

use it a day also. LCC wants to see the junction improved in all directions to enable people cycling on Petersham Road to turn onto the Quietway in either direction, and vice versa in comfort and safety. And while signage improvements are welcome, the current design is confusing for those on the Quietway routing, given in one direction people cycling are expected to join the ASL while in the other people cycling are expected to use the toucan crossing – hardly a consistent approach. The westbound design to the ASL also risks people starting to move into the ASL just as the lights change. In other words, this junction needs a more clear and safe design to enable all-ages, all-abilities cycling.

- **Ham Common** – given the long sightlines, gentle curves and lack of any traffic calming on this road, it's likely vehicle speeds and aggression on it can be high even if traffic volumes are low. Much more must be done here to qualify for Quietway status – a modally filtered cell would be ideal, and measures to slow and calm traffic, as well as design to ensure car parking doesn't create conflict points between people cycling and driving. It's also worth noting that the shared path here appears to be of little use – it puts people cycling too close to parked cars and into conflict with those exiting them, and ends shortly anyway.
- **Martingales Close junction** – tightening of junction geometries is welcome, but this will need to be a radical change, as the current layout is clearly designed to maintain high vehicle speeds. Further traffic calming measures would also be welcome here – a raised table if no modal filtering is to be used. And if the shared use path to the east is retained, more design work needs to be done to facilitate safe and comfortable transitions to it for those previously cycling in the road.
- **Ham Common/Ham Street/Lock Road junction** – this is not mentioned in the Quietway plan, yet would be clearly be uncomfortable to navigate for a wider range of people cycling – with no speed control, priority against the route and wide junction radii reinforced by bollards – likely indicating past speed or driver aggression issues at this spot. It needs some interventions to calm it appropriately.
- **Lock Road** – the use of sinusoidal speed humps to replace cushions is welcome. However, given the long sightlines and narrow carriageway due to parked cars, this measure solely will not reduce driver aggression and conflict with people cycling sufficiently for a Quietway. A modal filter scheme in this area would be the simplest and most beneficial answer, most likely. And/or other measures such as regular passing places (or removal of all parking from one side), or breaking up the sightline etc. could help.
- **Broughton Avenue** – more measures to reduce traffic speed and improve visibility for people cycling in this stretch should be deployed. Removing all parking from one side should be achievable. But even then, there is a concern that people cycling will be forced to interact with buses along this section which is far from ideal for a Quietway. A tiger crossing to the path would also facilitate children arriving at and leaving school by bus and by foot.
- **Shared use path junctions** – the proposal to build out the footway at Broughton Avenue and raise the carriageway at Hardwicke Road, plus get rid of guardrailings is welcome – this should be done at both ends in order to ensure comfortable access for a wide range of people using cargo bikes, trikes, adapted cycles etc. Therefore any replacement intervention should adhere to LCDS widths etc. to facilitate as diverse a range of cycles as possible (3.2.3 figure 3.4) without enabling car access.

- **Riverside Drive junction** – the existing crossing is an informal raised table. The carriageway should be narrowed more here – to 6m width – and a tiger crossing introduced. Directly west of the junction, design consideration needs to be taken on inclusive cycling and either the current gate or low-level wooden bollard arrangement to ensure wider cycles can pass through.
- **Broom Road** – Again, this is a fairly wide, long road, with minimal traffic calming (speed cushions indicate there is likely a speed problem, but has also likely not been solved) and wide corner radii. More needs to be done at the junction of Ferry Road and on to ensure traffic speeds are low and drivers behave calmly.
- **Ferry Road/Kingston Road/Broom Road junction** – this is a wide junction with a road with high traffic flows. Nearby, DfT traffic counts for 2015 show nearly 15,000 vehicles use Kingston Road daily, with over 200 HGVs and over 350 people cycling (but this has dropped dramatically in the last ten years – indicating either suppressed demand or the opening of alternative routes). The proposals are welcome but go nowhere near far enough to enable all-ages, all-abilities cycling (or even not represent a serious barrier to most people cycling). A radical redesign is required with people cycling separated from motor vehicle movements in time and/or space – for all arms and all turning movements.
- **Teddington High Street** – This is a wide and fast road with high numbers of buses. DfT traffic counts show that 11,235 vehicles including over 200 HGVs and over 500 cyclists use it daily. People cycling on it have doubled since 2000, so it clearly is a desire line - but in this scheme remains a major barrier with far too little done to it. The only likely viable solution to enabling a Quietway through here is segregated tracks for cycling. Even reducing road speeds to 20mph, removing the mini-roundabouts and much of the parking would be unlikely to result in a calm, comfortable cycling environment – and there will likely be numerous CLoS critical fails through this section.
- **High Street/Station Road roundabout** – Again, the proposals absolutely fail to enable all-ages, all-abilities cycling (they won't even enable comfortable cycling for most current people cycling) through this complex and hostile space. There must be a far better solution to this space than the proposals – particularly given the large amount of actual space here. DfT traffic counts show the roundabout is used daily by 17,354 vehicles including nearly 700 HGVs. Cycling numbers have dropped dramatically since 2011 – indicating that most people cycling currently actively avoid this roundabout.
- **Park Road** – And again, far too little has been proposed here to appropriately calm what is a wide, straight main road.
- **Adelaide Road, Victoria Road and Avenue Gardens** – given these streets, although primarily residential, service Teddington rail station, more will need to be done than just introducing 20mph speed limits – physical speed reduction measures at the least will be necessary (eg sinusoidal speed humps). Again, narrow, straight roads with parking both sides also will likely mean cycle-driver conflicts.
- **Park Road junction** – Again, too little is proposed here despite the huge amount of space available. Any solution should see people cycling comfortably across the junction. And how would those cycling to/from Avenue Gardens access the toucan crossing? Presumably using a narrow section of shared use footway. This would not be a good enough solution.

- **Bushy Park** – the proposals do not appear to cover what happens inside Bushy Park itself either – the route ends on a busy, straight road inside the park, with gates that will act as very problematic barriers to anyone trying to use the route outside of park hours.