

London Cycling Campaign

18 January 2017

Quietway 1 – Richmond Park to Bushy Park

https://consultation.richmond.gov.uk/environment/quietway1/consult_view/

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. The LCC welcomes the opportunity to comment on plans. The response is in support of the response from Richmond Cycling Campaign, the borough group, and was developed with input from the co-chairs of LCC's Infrastructure Review Group.

The intention of the scheme and some elements of it are supported. But some elements of the scheme require significant improvement before implementation to enable this route.

Specific points about the scheme:

- For Ham Gate Avenue, at a minimum the path needs surfacing appropriately. Far more appropriate would be to reduce parking and provide segregated cycle tracks instead. Whichever solution is used, then all road crossings and driveways should feature the path given clear physical priority across – as a “continuous footway” perhaps, on a raised table, and with junction radii and entry widths narrowed to encourage calm and courteous driver behaviour to vulnerable road users crossing.
- Also, and this should come from a separate, non-cycling budget, speeds should be restricted to 20mph on the road and physical or camera enforcement implemented. Again this is to encourage positive interactions between drivers and more vulnerable road users.
- The junction with Petersham Road, Upper Ham Road, Ham Common and Ham Gate Avenue is busy, with nearly 14,000 vehicles counted daily on Upper Ham Road according to the DfT, over 300 of which are HGVs. The current scheme should be amended to ensure cyclists travelling west on Ham Common can rejoin the carriageway safely and are not at risk of turning vehicles doing this. Ideally, cycling and pedestrian crossing movements should also be prioritised in terms of timings, ease and comfort over motor vehicle movements. And dropped kerbs should be long to allow access for differing speeds, abilities and cycle design – they should also be positioned to avoid forcing those cycling to negotiate with queuing traffic.
- Motor vehicle speed and driver behaviour should be carefully controlled along the entire routing. On Ham Common, for instance, this means further work on junctions such as with Martingales Close – to tighten radii and entry/exit widths, possibly introducing “continuous footways” to reinforce pedestrian priority and calm, courteous driver behaviour, and reduce speeds with camera enforcement and/or physical measures such as raised tables. It may also mean further speed control work

on Ham Common, such as full-width sinusoidal speed humps. If traffic volumes are above 2,000PCUs on these roads (or any others in the scheme) daily, then further intervention will be required – such as removal of through motor vehicle traffic by opposing one-ways or modal filters etc.

- At the junction of Ham Common, Lock Road and Ham Street priority should be further reinforced. Tightened radii and making the junction slower would be useful.
- On Lock Road, speed cushions should be replaced with full-width sinusoidal speed humps and/or raised tables at junctions. Furthermore, parking should ideally be shifted to only one side, or regular passing places with parking removed should be included – to avoid aggressive and offputting conflicts between oncoming motor vehicles and those cycling, which are often the experience on such narrow, heavily-parked streets.
- Broughton Road is a direct route through the area, as well as being a bus route. Either traffic should be reduced on the road (as part of a modal filter cell, for instance, with “bus gate” to allow Broughton Road to continue as a bus route). Or the pavements should be designed for shared use – with encouragement for parents and children at the school here to cycle instead of drive etc.
- The proposal to install a parallel “tiger” crossing on Riverside Drive is welcome.
- The bridge at Teddington should urgently be reviewed with a view to increasing width and enabling those cycling to avoid dismounting – to positively enable all ages, all abilities cycling – part of the key focus for Quietway routes. For instance, this currently would unfairly disadvantage riders of adapted cycles, cargo bikes etc. for whom dismounting their cycles, walking them alongside etc. may be difficult or impossible.
- The Broom Road junction priority change is welcome – but more should be done to ensure calm, courteous driver behaviour at a fairly busy junction, particularly given the change may take time to bed in. A raised table or other speed control measure is a minimum.
- The Manor Road junction is wide, heavily-used by motor vehicle traffic and includes significant hook risks (primarily Kingston Road left into Ferry Road). And “early release”, while welcome for those arriving by cycle at the lights while red, offers no protection to those arriving at a green. This junction is a serious failure of this scheme currently – and needs a major redesign to enable those cycling (of all ages and abilities) to at least pass through calmly, safely and in comfort along the Ferry Road Quietway alignment. 20mph should also be strictly enforced – by camera or physical design.
- The A313 is a wide, fast and busy road. It carries over 11,000 motor vehicles daily according to the DfT (rising to over 17,000 near the main roundabout), and over 200 HGVs (rising to nearly 700), plus over 500 buses or coaches. It is a bus route also.

This alignment, without proper safe space for cycling, is in no way acceptable for a “Quietway” aimed at encouraging a wider range of people to cycle than currently. And this current design will fail to significantly increase cycling numbers in this area on that basis. It also looks from the drawings that lane widths may fall within the 3.2-4m width to count as a “critical fail” under Cycling Level of Design Standards. For this to be a Quietway, speeds need to be reduced (and that reduction enforced) and motor traffic volumes also, quite dramatically. Otherwise, protected space for cycling or an alternative routing of this section should be moved to.

- Design elements for side streets should ideally be consistent – for instance raised tables throughout, narrowed entry/exit widths and corner radii, potentially “continuous footway” treatments for any low traffic side street etc.
- Cycle tracks around the mini roundabouts are very welcome – but will not enable a wider range of people to cycle unless these tracks are extended along the busy sections of the main roads the route runs along on both sides.
- Park Road is also busy – with over 8,000 motor vehicles using it daily, nearly 200 buses or coaches and over 100 HGVs. Again, unless significant changes are made to the scheme to recognise how hostile this environment will be to cycle in, it will not enable a much wider range of people to cycle this route.
- An alternative approach that would avoid both High Street and Park Road would be to create a crossing of the railway line. The existing bridge crossing at Cromwell Road (junction with Blackmores Grove) to Clarence Road could be redesigned and enabled for cycling.
- Turns out of Adelaide Road into Park Road are currently not designed for.
- The roads around Teddington station should be designed to encourage calm, courteous driver behaviour – with sinusoidal full-width speed humps and/or raised tables at junctions, good sightlines using parking restrictions at bends and junctions, regular passing places etc.
- The junction of Park Road, Avenue Gardens and Chestnut Avenue needs care and some reconsideration to enable a wider range of people to cycle across it. Signalising the crossing and separating cycle movements from motor vehicle movements would be the ideal. If the current design is to be progressed, more thought needs to be given to potential conflict as those cycling cross the carriage to reach the crossing (eg northbound from Chestnut Avenue, and northbound into Avenue Gardens). And speeds and behaviour should be tightly controlled through the junction – perhaps with a raised table.

General points about cycling schemes:

- LCC requires schemes to be designed to accommodate growth in cycling. Providing space for cycling is a more efficient use of road space than providing space for

driving private motor vehicles, particularly for journeys of 5km or less. In terms of providing maximum efficiency for space and energy use, walking, cycling, then public transport are key.

- As demonstrated by the success of recent Cycle Superhighways and mini-Holland projects etc., people cycle when they feel safe. For cycling to become mainstream, a network of high-quality, direct routes separate from high volumes and/or speeds of motor vehicle traffic is required to/from all key destinations and residential areas in an area. Schemes should be planned, designed and implemented to maximise potential to increase journeys – with links to nearby amenities, residential centres, transport hubs considered from the outset.
- Spending money on cycling infrastructure has been shown to dramatically boost health outcomes in an area. Spending on cycling schemes outranks all other transport mode for return on investment according to a DfT study. Schemes which promote cycling meet TfL's "Healthy Streets" checklist. A healthy street is one where people choose to cycle.
- LCC wants, as a condition of funding, all "Quietways" 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.