

London Cycling Campaign response to Sutton St Helier area Cycleway

4 November 2019

<https://sutton.citizenspace.com/environment/stheliercycleway/>

About the London Cycling Campaign

London Cycling Campaign (LCC) is a charity with more than 20,000 supporters of whom over 11,000 are fully paid-up members. We speak up on behalf of everyone who cycles or wants to cycle in Greater London; and we speak up for a greener, healthier, happier and better-connected capital.

This response was developed with input from LCC's borough groups.

General comments on this scheme:

- The principle of cycle provision in this area is supported, however there are significant caveats with this scheme, as detailed below.
- We fully support the response of our local borough group, which contains more specific detail.

Specific points about this scheme:

- The scheme/Cycleway would be fairly indirect and not visible or legible easily to those driving in the area – this approach risks ensuring that such a scheme would not entice those already cycling on main roads and direct routes in the area to use it, not widely trigger modal shift from those driving in the area and indeed limit the take-up of residents who might cycle in the area. Similarly, the scheme fails to connect safely, comfortably and directly to several key amenities and trip generators in the area near the scheme, this further limits the likelihood it will enable more people to cycle in the area. These issues should be rectified, and Cycleway schemes should in general be safe and comfortable but also direct as below.
- 20mph zones and schemes that rely on signage alone do not see large reductions in motor traffic speeds or widespread compliance with speed limits among motorists. Using a “low traffic neighbourhood” approach to the Stavordale Road area would be preferable, removing through motor traffic completely. But at a minimum, physical speed reduction measures such as full-width, sinusoidal profile speed humps should be used as well as signage.
- The literature for the scheme does not confirm whether and how it conforms with TfL's Quality Criteria for Cycleway schemes. The information, for instance, on motor traffic volumes and 85th centile speeds for streets in this scheme would be very useful to assess if the criteria is being used properly and indeed resulting in good

likely outcomes for cycling.

- Robertsbridge Road in the context of the Quality Criteria and 20mph zone is a particular concern – it is long, straight and features higher volumes of motor traffic than other streets in the area and higher levels than many will feel comfortable cycling in.
- Cycleway routes through and across parks and woodland areas, even when well lit, dramatically reduce the uptake and use of such routes particularly among some demographics such as women after dark. Such routes are generally not recommended.
- The crossings of Bishopsford Road and Wrythe Lane should be improved. Parallel crossings rather than zebra and toucan arrangements should be used on all crossings. These should be on raised, full-width tables. And removing the pedestrian refuges, as well as unnecessary turn lane into Malmesbury Road, hatching etc. could in the future create more space for cycle tracks or wider pavements etc.
- Similarly, the entry/exit of Malmesbury would see cyclists exiting Malmesbury forced to cross the path of oncoming motor traffic to reach the crossing. Malmesbury could be filtered at this junction to remove these issues, and that enable a far better crossing. At the least, Malmesbury should be redesigned with reduced entrance/exit radii, cobbles removed and steeper raised table, to ensure drivers turn in and out as calmly and slowly as possible.

General points about infrastructure schemes:

- The Mayor's Transport Strategy relies on a growth in cycle trips to keep London moving. This means infrastructure schemes must 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 and enable all ages and abilities to cycle, 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 modes 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.

- All schemes should be designed to enable people of all ages and abilities to cycle, including disabled people.
- Evidence from TfL and from many schemes in London, the UK and worldwide shows the economic benefits, including to businesses, to be found from enabling a wider range of people to cycle more. Further evidence shows how cycling schemes also benefit air quality and reduce climate changing emissions, as well as improving resident health outcomes and reducing inactivity, as mentioned above.
- LCC wants, as a condition of funding, all highway development designed to London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS), with a Cycling Level of Service (CLOS) rating of 70 or above, with all “critical issues” eliminated. Above 2,000 Passenger Car Unit (PCUs) motor vehicle movements per day, or 20mph motor traffic speeds, cycling should be physically separated from motor traffic.