

London Cycling Campaign

25 August 2016

Kingston upon Thames Draft Cocks Crescent SPD

http://consult.kingston.gov.uk/portal/planning/cocks_crescent_spd

Do you support this vision for Cocks Crescent?

Somewhat Favour

Do you support the overarching principles for the vision for Cocks Crescent?

Somewhat Favour

It is worth noting that “health and well-being should underpin regeneration of the area” and “create a cohesive form of development that promotes sustainable methods of transport and strengthens links between key destinations” are key principles and that a popular outcome from the first round of residential consultation was “limit congestion and rat-running on local roads”.

To what extent do you agree that the illustrative masterplan is consistent with the vision for Cocks Crescent?

Somewhat Favour

To what extent do you agree with the proposed ‘Land Use Strategy’?

Somewhat Favour

It is of great concern that the SPD is not explicit in the need to reduce car parking availability across the site. This should be explicitly stated. The currently total level of car parking is firstly obviously too high and includes surplus (hence floors of the multi-storey car park not being used). But it also should be a key understanding of town centre regeneration that car parking availability can easily lead to induced demand of car driven journeys.

There is evidence to show that restricting car parking and car access in favour of cycle parking and pedestrian and cycling-friendly design and access points to a town centre (including removal of motor vehicle traffic from the centre itself) increases the economic viability of the town centre.

In other words, if you allow large amounts of car parking, then the town centre will remain blighted, and most people will drive to it. If you restrict car parking and instead focus on walking and cycling access, more people will come to the shops and spend more.

To what extent do you agree with the proposed ‘Access and Movement Strategy’?

Somewhat Favour

As well as concerns over car parking, it is vital, particularly given anticipated raised modal share for cycling due to nearby Go Cycle development, that any design that goes forward does not introduce any barriers to cycling through this development – so hook risks by drivers entering or emerging

from the site must be considered very carefully; as must routing for those cycling or walking to reach the site as easily as possible, more easily than for those driving.

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 local borough group Kingston Cycling Campaign.

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 is also strongly suggests that all schemes including cycling provision should be of comparable quality to similar schemes at 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.