

## **QuietWay 5 Waterloo-Croydon Part 2 Consultation response**

**19 November 2015**

Supporting Lambeth Cyclists' consultation response

<http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/consultations/proposed-changes-to-quietway-5-cycle-route-waterloo-to-croydon-part-2>

### **Brommells Road and Clapham Common (north): Do you support the proposed changes?**

**YES**

While we support the raising of the carriageway on Bromell's Road, London Cycling Campaign would like to ensure a defined "carriage" marked remains to encourage drivers not to consider the pavements as two effective lanes etc.

We are also concerned about the use of cobble strips to slow cyclists. If too prominent they can be uncomfortable for some users (including for those riders with disabilities) to ride over, and can become both a maintenance issue and hazard after time.

### **Rookery Road crossing: Do you support the proposed changes?**

**PARTIALLY**

The London Cycling Campaign supports narrowing the carriageway for motor traffic along Rookery Road. However, given current usage of the road including proportion of commercial vehicles, vans etc. the current plans do not offer good enough space for cycling, including those leaving or joining CS7.

We would support Lambeth Cyclists' calls for physically separated tracks for cyclists with provision in both directions - it should not be impossible to find space for this.

At the very least, any cycle lane should run continuously from Clapham Road to Long Lane, and should be suitably wide - 2m or more would be appropriate. If such a lane is to go in, we'd also suggest using semi-segregated "armadillos" or similar to ensure lanes are not encroached on by vehicles and to provide increased sense of safety for users.

The London Cycling Campaign would also strongly suggest separating cyclists and pedestrians where speed differentials are likely to be high and/or usage is likely to be high. This is likely to be the case on the proposed shared use paths inside the common. The Lambeth Cyclists' group say the existing parallel cycle and pedestrian paths on Clapham Common work well. So we, like them, would argue for using the existing system instead of the proposed switch to shared space. And, like them, would argue that 3m shared space is not enough for likely high flows of pedestrians and cyclists.

We also support the raised double crossing. And would make the point that a parallel crossing would lead more naturally into separate space for cyclists and pedestrians on either side.

**Playground area: Do you support the proposed changes?**

**YES**

The London Cycling Campaign would raise again the concerns about using cobbles as an appropriate way of slowing cyclists.

We would also suggest the paths are 5m wide, given the number of families and small children in this area.

We would also suggest more cycle parking - and parking that is inclusive of increasingly common child-carrying bikes, trikes etc. Current cyclists use the railings or take their bikes into the playground - presumably the aim would be to discourage this and encourage use of formal provision. Given this, more than six stands and stands that are designed to be appropriate for long and/or wide bikes would be suggested.

**Windmill Drive: Do you support the proposed changes?**

**YES**

The London Cycling Campaign supports the closure of Windmill Drive to through traffic. We also support the removal of car parking spaces within the common and partial replacement at its periphery.

Again, we'd suggest 3m is too narrow for a shared use path. And please note earlier comments re: cobble strips.

**Clapham Common Path (southern section): Do you support the proposed changes?**

**YES**

As per previous comments, we consider the 3m width of shared use path and use of cobble strips as issues worth re-considering.

**(A3) Long Road on Clapham Common (TfL scheme): Do you support the proposed changes?**

**YES**

The London Cycling Campaign would prefer the QuietWay paths through the common met directly, and as close to the crossing as possible. This would minimise cyclist/pedestrian conflict.

We would also prefer a design that rather than used a shared use path along Long Road, instead moved towards segregated cycle tracks here, distinct from the roadway and pavement.