

London Cycling Campaign

10 August 2017

Wandsworth Nine Elms and Battersea Park Road

https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/nine-elms-lane/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 30,000 supporters. The LCC welcomes the opportunity to comment on proposals. The response is in support of the response from Wandsworth Cycling Campaign, London Cycling Campaign's local branch, and was developed with input from LCC's Infrastructure Advisory Panel.

Over 1,200 people cycle on Nine Elms daily, over 1,500 on Battersea Park Road (DfT manual traffic counts, 2012). Yet these roads are also the spine of one of the largest housing development sites in London. They feature over 1,000 HGV movements daily and circa 19,000 other motor vehicle movements. When these development sites are finished and occupied, the ambition is for this area to be "more cycle-friendly than Amsterdam" according to previous Mayor Boris Johnson and for "a cycle network that provides access to all areas of Nine Elms on the South Bank, makes walking or cycling the obvious mode for short journeys, is sympathetic to the walking environment and is accessible to anyone with a bicycle," according to TfL's Vauxhall Nine Elms Cycling Strategy.

This scheme is opposed as it does not provide substantial safe space for cycling, particularly not for all ages and all abilities of those cycling. As such, while it does confer some limited safety benefits, they are too few to justify this scheme – and TfL and Wandsworth council must urgently redesign the scheme to improve matters for those cycling. There are examples of other schemes in London that have managed to provide far superior, safer space for cycling, on roads with heavy traffic and bus routes.

Specific points about the scheme:

- Bus lanes, particularly on high-frequency routes, are not appropriate cycling infrastructure to enable a far wider range of people to cycle in an area. Bus lanes and cycle lanes with loading in at certain hours further reduce any amenity conferred to those cycling through the area and further reduce any potential usage by those who do not currently cycle in the area. Advisory lanes are of even less use. And cycle lanes interrupted by bus cages similarly restrict any amenity the infrastructure might confer.
- The consultation is confused and/or misleading on physical protection for cycling, citing "stepped tracks" etc. when there does not appear to be such infrastructure in the scheme drawings. There appear to be long sections of mandatory lane that could be converted to stepped tracks or other physically separated space for cycling, but where this option has not been applied.
- Unsignalised junctions with side roads and access ways should be appropriately treated to ensure turning motor vehicles proceed slowly and with caution when turning across cycle lanes and tracks. This is particularly of concern where side roads are likely to feature a high

flow of large vehicles (e.g. Covent Garden Market car park).

- Wherever possible, schemes should be considered in the context of the network of residential streets beyond, and treatments such as “modal filter cells” should be considered to reduce turning movements into and out of side streets and/or reduce any risk of motor vehicle traffic displacing onto residential streets.
- Wide central traffic islands are to be discouraged wherever possible – these encourage drivers to higher speeds and use up space that could otherwise be used to provide safe and physically separated cycle tracks etc.
- The scheme features many “early start” signals – yet these offer no protection to those cycling who arrive at the junction on a green signal, and instead retain turning vehicle collision risks.
- At the Queenstown Road junction, significant risks are retained of collisions between turning motor vehicles and those cycling. The junction also forces cyclists going ahead and east to cross lanes of turning traffic. A “hold the left” design at the least should be implemented here.
- Turning motor vehicle risks are also retained at the Prince Of Wales Drive/Havelock Terrace junction, the complex Prospect Way/Savona Street junction, Kirtling Street/New Covent Garden junction, Cringle Street/Moat Street junction and Ponton Road junction (coming out of Ponton Road).
- Major junctions should be designed to enable turning movements in comfort and convenience for those cycling coming from and going to all directions. Two-stage right turn designs are inferior to other, more convenient and safer-feeling options, and should be avoided where possible. However, provision for all arms of a junction is a minimum.
- The scheme should design for those cycling and walking to be able to cross conveniently, in comfort and safety from side streets (particularly key ones) across the road to join cycle tracks etc. on the other side, and/or to other side streets opposite.
- The Thames Path, that runs parallel to this route, has sections where cycling is banned. Given this, it is imperative that this scheme proposal is improved as there are no other viable parallel routes nearby.

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 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.