

New Canary Wharf and Rotherhithe river crossing

4 December 2017

<https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/rivercrossings/rotherhithe-canarywharf/?cid=r2cw-crossing>

This consultation response is on behalf of the London Cycling Campaign, the capital's leading cycling organisation with more than 12,000 members and 30,000 supporters. The LCC welcomes the opportunity to comment on proposals. This response was developed with input from Tower Hamlets Wheelers and Southwark Cyclists, London Cycling Campaign's local branches, and LCC's Infrastructure Advisory Panel.

A river crossing at this location is supported, and LCC preference would be for a bridge. A bridge crossing would be likely to deliver the greatest benefits in terms of likely uptake as a walking and cycling route for the money spent.

Specific points about this scheme:

- Of the three proposals, the bridge crossing is most supported. It would provide near-constant access across the river for those cycling and walking and it would be more pleasant to use and cheaper to construct than the tunnel option. London already features part-time crossings with waiting times for cycling and they have proven historically unpopular – so the ferry is the least useful of the three options.
- Any crossing should feature enough width to include high flows of those cycling and walking with capacity built in to more than cope with predicted future potential demand; should feature gentle slopes (1:40 overall, with short sections of maximum 1:20) to enable a wide range of people to cycle and walk across; should not feature steps or lifts (without other sloped provision); should be protected from side-winds (and potentially feature a canopy or roof); with a high grip surface for a wide range of people to cycle on in all conditions.
- Given the above, the Option 3: Southern Alignment is not supported without modifications to the plan to provide appropriate ramps at both ends.
- The height of any bridge should balance the amount of time annually the bridge will be required to be closed with how much more effort it will require walking and cycling users, particularly those with mobility impairments etc., to ascend and descend over the bridge. Given this, Option 1 is probably preferable to Option 2 as it features a shorter moveable span and therefore shorter time closed each time the bridge is raised.
- Option 1 is also likely preferable as it features a more direct connection into the employment centres of the Isle of Dogs, and better onward connections to other walking and cycling routes to Limehouse Basin, the Lee Valley, CS3 etc. This also would mean better connections to the priority routes 11, 12, 13 and 14 south of the Thames and 4, 5 and 8 north. This option should directly connect to both NCN1 (Thames Path) and an improved Westferry Road.
- Wherever the bridge lands, high-quality walking and cycling connections to and from it to existing and planned routes and nearby amenities, centres of employment, dense residential areas, new developments (such as Canada Water), transport interchanges etc. are vital – including connections to Cycle Superhighway CS4 on the southern bank. In all options this is

likely to require further schemes at both ends to appropriately connect the bridge into nearby walking and cycling routes.

- As well as this river crossing, other walking, cycling and public transport river crossings should be considered for elsewhere on the Thames – including further east; while proposals to enable more motor vehicles to cross the Thames, such as the “Silvertown Tunnel” scheme as currently proposed, should not go forward, if London is to achieve the modal share targets and shift set out in the Mayor’s Transport Strategy. Current river crossings should also be urgently improved for those already walking and cycling across them where facilities for such are substandard, such as at Tower Bridge.

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.
- All schemes should be designed to enable people of all ages and abilities to cycle, including disabled people.
- 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 Fails” eliminated.