



Lambeth: Norwood Road
Consultation Response – London Cycling Campaign

Friday 22nd July 2016

PROPOSAL: Footways

Because the pavements along Norwood Road are in a poor state of repair, and in public workshops local residents and businesses felt the footways are congested, it is proposed:

- *to widen footways from Chestnut Road to Leigham Vale*
- *to resurface pavements*
- *create raised crossings at pavement level on the side roads where they enter Norwood Road*

1. To what extent do you agree with this proposal?

LCC Response: Somewhat agree

Further comments

Agreement is predicated on two-way working for cycling being facilitated. We note that the drawings show Harpenden Road would become one way, but no indication is shown to allow two-way working for cyclists. This needs to be designed for in existing one-way streets too – e.g. Avenue Park Road.

Side road treatments should be, as far as is possible, consistent throughout the scheme and throughout Lambeth. We want side road treatments to not just be raised, but as steeply raised as possible, with as tight junction radii as possible and as narrow entry/exit as possible. This ensures slower speeds and better driver behaviour for those turning in or out.

Between Chestnut Road and Chatsworth Way, workshop attendees highlighted that the pavement on the east side of the road is particularly crowded thanks to high numbers of pedestrians and narrow footways. The road here is the narrowest section of Norwood Road and drivers and cyclists find this section particularly congested and were concerned about the dangers caused by parked car doors opening into the narrow road.

2. It is proposed that this section of pavement is also widened. There are two options for this, please select the option you prefer

LCC Preferred Option: Widen the pavement by up to 2m to create a spacious pavement with room for greening and seating as well as reducing congestion for pedestrians. This option would mean the removal of 12 parking spaces along the east side of the road – some can be replaced elsewhere in

the scheme (in Waylett Place car park and elsewhere on Norwood Road or near the junctions on Norwood Road) but there would be a net loss of around 6 car parking spaces from this change.

Further comments

We favour the first option. However we also believe that given pavement widths and road lane widths, it looks possible there is enough width for stepped or segregated cycle tracks, particularly if parking is further consolidated and/or shifted to side roads.

Without such proposals, it's likely the scheme will retain a "Critical Fail" for cycling and Norwood Road will remain a barrier to cycling in the area.

Crossings at Chestnut Road, Lansdowne Hill and likely other side roads that have relatively high motor vehicle flows also do not feature raised entry treatments – yet these are precisely the roads that most need them, where those cycling or on foot will suffer the greatest risk of a collision from a vehicle turning too fast.

The ideal solution would be an area-wide "modal filter cell" that removed through traffic from residential streets. If that was in place, "continuous", "Copenhagen" or "blended" crossings with tight radii and entry/exit widths would be suitable. If "modal filters" using bollards, planters or gates are considered beyond the pale, opposing one-ways or resident only camera systems could be considered.

The link between Elmcourt Road and Palace Road (a blue cycle route on the TfL maps) should be made child cycle friendly through the provision of tracks and a crossing.

Crossing

In public workshops, local people highlighted the junction at Norwood Road/ Lancaster Avenue/ York Hill as challenging to cross – the width of road is too far to cross diagonally in the time allowed so many pedestrians need to wait for the green figure twice if they wish to cross from one corner to another.

It is proposed to install a diagonal crossing with pavements widened at each corner. The reduced distance to cross diagonally created by the wider pavements would enable pedestrians to cross in a shorter time, and would not have a significant impact on bus journey times.

3. To what extent do you agree with this proposal?

LCC Response: Agree

Further comments

Again, a diagonal crossing for pedestrians is welcome – but a) does very little indeed for those cycling, where there does appear to be space for cycling tracks, and b) fails to address fundamental issues of traffic volumes and speeds on all arms of this junction.

There seems little reason to enable the volumes of through traffic that are likely to be currently using both Lancaster Avenue and York Hill to continue to do so. Removing much of the through traffic from these streets and the residential areas they form part of would be an ideal solution.

Workshop attendees and students at Elmgreen School said that Norwood Road is difficult to cross by the junctions of Harpenden Road and ElmCourt Road. This is a particularly busy crossing point at the start and end of the school day, and when people want to catch the bus south. It is proposed to add a new zebra crossing here – in order to accommodate a pedestrian crossing on Norwood Road and to prevent any rat-running traffic, Harpenden Road would need to become entry only from Norwood Road.

4. To what extent do you agree with adding this zebra crossing by the junction of Harpenden Road?

LCC Response: Agree

Further comments

Again, while this proposal is welcome, it misses several tricks. With a modal filter cell in place, the residential areas could become quiet routes for walking and cycling. This would be far more effective than making Harpenden Road one-way.

With a modal filter cell in place, it would also be possible to create a cycling link to Elmcourt Road and on which would a) cross fairly closely to Tulse Hill station, b) just need a way of riding along a short stretch of Norwood Road and b) require a “tiger” crossing instead of a zebra.

There should be a child-friendly and well-signed cycle route between the east side of Norwood Road and the west side, linking such trip attractions as Elmgreen School and West Norwood Health and Leisure Centre with its new swimming pool.

5. It may be possible to have a different type of crossing e.g. traffic lights. Which option do you prefer?

LCC Preferred Option: A zebra crossing is uncontrolled, which was felt to be safer for students crossing the road. However, at busy times of day it would be used regularly which could slow down traffic.

Further comments

Consideration should also be given to putting the crossing on a raised table to further slow traffic and improve driver compliance.

Station Rise

Station Rise was highlighted as somewhere which could create a sense of a town centre by Tulse Hill Station. Workshop attendees and people at the Twist street market were keen that it became a community space. The proposals are to create a pedestrian friendly space with reduced parking, like by Herne Hill Station. This would create spaces for a regular market, greening, seating and cafes to have chairs outside. There would be a disabled parking space, and two bays to use for loading.

This would involve:

- Restricting the number of vehicles
- Widening pavements

- A “Copenhagen crossing” which means raising the level of the entrance to Station Rise to be the same as the pavement

*** 6. To what extent do you agree with these proposals?**

LCC Response: Strongly agree

Further comments

This is an ideal location for a “Copenhagen” crossing. But there needs to be clarity on entrance that access is very limited for motor vehicles. Cycle parking here should be in numbers to reflect future demand, not current demand.

7. Would you like to see a market in Station Rise?

LCC Response: Yes

Further comments

11. Are there any other comments you wish to make regarding the Norwood Road consultation so far?

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 the coordinator of our borough group, Lambeth Cyclists.

In general, the London Cycling Campaign want, 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). We would also strongly suggest 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.

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

1. The consultation and Norwood Road scheme was developed specifically to, among other elements, find “ways to make it safer for cyclists” (<http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/consultations/norwood-road>). Yet there do not appear to be fundamental improvements to safety for those currently cycling along Norwood Road, let alone enable safe cycling for a wider range of people. We are concerned that the offer by Lambeth Cyclist’s coordinator in February of voluntary time to review plans with the architect was not taken advantage of by the Council.
2. DfT traffic counts show over 500 cyclists a day currently use this stretch of Norwood Road, having doubled in the last ten years. Yet those cyclists must mix with approximately 700 HGVs and over 23,000 motor vehicles a day. These figures are far above the numbers that TfL’s LCDS suggests and LCC policy requires separate and safe space for cycling.

3. There are not details on lane widths, but it is concerning that wide road lanes are being touted as a benefit to cycling. To be clear, LCDS suggests that vehicle lane widths where cyclists are expected to share, between 3.2m and 4.0m are a CLoS “Critical Fail” and represent the most dangerous and uncomfortable widths to ride in. But that is not to imply it is fun, safe or comfortable to ride in lane widths over 4.0m, especially when expected to ride next to heavy and/or potentially fast-moving traffic (another CLoS “Critical Fail” in itself). We believe extra width should be used to create segregated and safe space for cycling, not create wiggle room for vehicles – where it may end up being used to over and undertake and/or informally/double park.
4. In a subsequent scheme Lambeth Cyclists expect to see a contraflow cycle track going south on Knight’s Hill – Lambeth Cyclists recommended in February that work is designed and undertaken within the current Norwood Road scheme to allow a transition to the cycle track when it is built.

We would be grateful for further updates on this scheme as it progresses and Simon Munk, LCC’s Infrastructure Campaigner is available to answer any queries regarding this submission:

simonm@lcc.org.uk / 020 7234 9310