London Cycling Campaign

21 July 2016

Kingston Fountain roundabout mini-Holland

<u>http://consult.kingston.gov.uk/portal/planning/go/consultations_summer_2016/go_cycle_</u> <u>fountain_roundabout_new_malden</u>

This consultation response is 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 plans. Our response was developed with input from the co-chairs of our Infrastructure Review Group and in support of our borough group, Kingston Cycling Campaign's response.

The most efficient road space use is not for private motor vehicles. The London Cycling Campaign therefore generally expects schemes to be designed to accommodate growth in cycling and to reduce motor vehicle traffic – particularly for journeys 5km or less. In general, the London Cycling Campaign want, as a condition of funding, all "Mini-Holland" 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. The Kingston Cycling Campaign have identified several "Critical Fails" at this junction.

Given that, we wish to raise the following specific points with the scheme and its surrounds:

- Broadly, we oppose this scheme for a mini-Holland scheme, too little has been done to enable and encourage cycling. The key issue is that tracks do not run on all arms to and from the junction, nor are safe turns in all directions successfully enabled. The result will be a scheme that does not enable many new people to cycle through the area, retaining this junction as a barrier, and offers only partial safety improvements for those currently cycling – many of whom will retain in the road rather than face delays on shared use pavements, thus negating some of the likely safety benefits. Two-tier novice/vehicular cycling design is certainly not appropriate for a "Mini-Holland" scheme.
- 2. The scheme risks setting a very low bar for other cycling schemes associated with the "Mini-Holland" programme.
- 3. Crossings for pedestrians and those cycling should be, wherever possible, in a single stage. And side-by-side rather than toucan combined crossings.
- 4. There is a lack of clarity in drawings in general as to cycle track widths. Widths should adhere to at least LCDS widths for high cycling flow areas.
- 5. Shared footways without physical delineation between cycling and pedestrian areas are shown to fail with anything but low volumes of cycling and pedestrian use. Given this is a mini-Holland scheme, that should not be a scenario designed for. Shared footways are also a bigger problem where space is an issue as at some corners here.
- 6. To increase cycling, junctions such as this need to not only be safer and feel safer but feel easy to navigate. It seems unlikely that all-ages, all-abilities cycling will be enabled given the likely continuingly car-dominated feel of this junction design, the need to do two-stage rights without any apparent clarity and the baked-in conflict between pedestrians and those cycling.

- 7. Transitions between track, shared footway and carriageway do not seem likely to be easy, comfortable or predictable. This includes a lack of clarity for those entering or exiting shared footway.
- 8. Corner radii are designed for turns at speed this increases the hostility of this junction. Where those cycling are expected to rejoin the carriageway, more care also needs to be taken to design to avoid drivers jockeying for space/lanes.
- 9. There is a lack of clarity as to signal timings, method of control etc. It is vital those cycling and walking are not unnecessarily delayed to ensure compliance and a comfortable and safe environment. If a "scramble" phase is proposed, those cycling and walking may well cross diagonally and ideally that should be explicitly designed in, but at least informally designed in to avoid conflicts.
- 10. Specific items:
 - a. The bus stop bypass should be designed to current TfL standards.
 - b. Malden Road features a low-quality cycle lane that runs across a side road. This is absolutely not suitable "Mini-Holland" treatment.
 - c. Several side access crossings leave potential hook risks Balgowan Close, Charnwood Close, Presburg Road etc.
 - d. The scheme should use a bus stop bypass to link to the existing cycle track on Malden Road southbound.