

1 Having looked at the proposals, what best describe your views overall?

Strongly support

2 What impact do you think our proposals will have on pedestrians?

Positive

3 Do you have any further comments about the impact on pedestrians?

We welcome the replacement of the existing gyratory/one way system with two-way vehicle routing throughout as a means to reduce the hostility of the area to pedestrians and cyclists – although it should be noted clearly that gyratory removal in and of itself is not enough to dramatically improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists and should always be done (as here) alongside many other measures to improve the area.

While pedestrians get wider pavements at key pinch points, and increased numbers of crossings, with some crossings improved for directness also, there is still more that could and should be done to improve pedestrian experience. We propose:

- a) Wherever possible replace staggered carriageway crossings with direct crossings.
- b) Remove one of the left turn vehicle lanes from Wandsworth Road onto Bridgefoot – this is one of the narrowest spaces for both cyclists and pedestrians. Removing the second left turn lane would create enough space to widen both cycle track and pavement at this location. Failing that, other measures should be undertaken to widen both pavement and track at this pinch point.
- c) Consider a slight realignment of the Albert Embankment carriage at the approach to Bridgefoot, to the east. This would again allow a bit more space for pedestrians and cyclists at the pinch point in front of the MI6 building.
- d) Consider widening the pedestrian crossings at the island at the junction of Harleyford Road, Kennington Lane and South Lambeth Road.
- e) While the widening of the railway arch shared by pedestrians and cyclists is welcome, there is a concern it will still be too narrow at the eastern end given current pedestrian and cycle flows.
- f) Consider moving the pedestrian crossing on South Lambeth Road on the north side of the Parry Street junction slightly northwards and widening, to enable residents arriving from Vauxhall Grove and beyond to access the station more conveniently.

4 What impact do you think our proposals will have on cyclists?

Very positive

5 Do you have any further comments about the impact on cyclists?

The proposals are overall very positive for cyclists using the area – and appear to be of high quality enough to encourage more cyclists to ride through what was previously a hostile and unpleasant area to ride through.

We welcome extensive provision of protected space for cycling throughout the area. That said, we wish to highlight the following specific suggestions regarding the plan:

- a) Track and pavement widths...

- i. Cycle track (and pavement) widths remain a concern throughout – for instance the two way track on Bridgefoot appears narrower than before. The London Cycling Design Standards says high flow two-way tracks should be 4+ metres wide (2.5+ metres for one-way or “with flow” tracks). And anecdotally, we are aware that the track is already at peak times nearing capacity, before these additional improvements likely add increased users.
 - ii. While the widening of the railway arch shared by pedestrians and cyclists is welcome, there is a concern it will still be too narrow at the eastern end given current pedestrian and cycle flows.
 - iii. Remove one of the left turn vehicle lanes from Wandsworth Road onto Bridgefoot – this is one of the narrowest spaces for both cyclists and pedestrians. Removing the second left turn lane would create enough space to widen both cycle track and pavement at this location. Failing that, other measures should be undertaken to widen both at this pinch point.
 - iv. Consider a slight realignment of the Albert Embankment carriage at the approach to Bridgefoot, to the east. This would again allow a bit more space for pedestrians and cyclists at the pinch point in front of the MI6 building.
- b) Track design issues...
- i. The redesign of elements of CS5 in the area and rationalisation of the main crossings for CS5 is welcome. But there appears no need for the tight turn and kink in CS5 as it turns from Bridgefoot, to Albert Embankment, to the crossing to the railway arch. This is an unnecessary deflection and will be awkward to negotiate for cyclists. It also appears to be very confusing as to where cyclists turn and wait to cross and how turning cyclists will interact with cyclists passing north-south (or vice versa) through the area. This risks creating a conflict point here.
 - ii. Where the track crosses small side streets or access points, we would strongly suggest reducing the risk of “hook” collisions and strongly reinforcing pedestrian and cycle priority by: tightening kerb radii and straightening the junction as much as possible – aiming for 90-degree turns in and out for motor vehicles, rather than “slip road” angled approaches; using “blended”, “Copenhagen” or “continuous” crossings where the pavement and cycle track run directly across the junction, ideally with a raised table for vehicles to cross to further reinforce speed control; narrowing entry/exit to the side street to a single lane wherever possible; and running track segregation as close to the junction mouth as possible. Glyn Street, New Spring Gardens Walk, Vauxhall Grove, Langley Lane, Lawn Lane and the southern half of Bondway would benefit, plus all other yard, business frontage etc. access points.
 - iii. Corners are often places where turning motor vehicle traffic and cyclists can come into conflict – so physical protection on the corner of segregated tracks needs to be retained where possible. The junction of Miles Street and Bondway is one location where more protection might be beneficial.
 - iv. The access to Vauxhall Pleasure Gardens and Kennington Lane for cyclists coming from the south is unclear and appears to be convoluted.

- v. The new plans for Kennington Lane are unclear. Why is there no provision on the southern side? And what protection is there for cyclists using the north side track? We would expect “semi-segregated” protection as a minimum on a road this busy.
 - vi. The turn for cyclists crossing Bridgefoot from Wandsworth Road onto the bridge appears to be very tight.
 - vii. It remains unclear how cyclists will exit Miles Street onto the Wandsworth Road track.
 - viii. The route turning westbound from Wandsworth Road into Nine Elms Lane is overly convoluted. If Nine Elms Lane is to have one-way “with flow” cycling provision on both sides of the carriage further along, then that should likely start from the junction.
 - ix. For cyclists riding eastbound on New Spring Gardens, they must cross a lane of traffic to access the track – which will be a fraught and potentially dangerous manoeuvre. An alternative would be to continue a track south on the east side of Albert Embankment (as well as the two-way track on the west side) to the bridge junction. This would also probably have the benefit of cutting likely pedestrian/cyclist conflicts around the Royal Vauxhall Tavern – by diverting the likely route cyclists will take heading southbound on Albert Embankment towards South Lambeth Road – and likely increasing cyclist use of the tracks rather than carriage.
 - x. Why does the northbound track on the southern half of Bondway end before the junction? And where are cyclists from this track intended to go next? Across the crossing? If so, the link to the crossing and type of crossing needs to be designed appropriately to ensure clarity and to design out conflict between cyclists and pedestrians.
- c) South Lambeth Road design issues...
- i. We understand that Lambeth Council has plans for a Quietway linking Vauxhall and Stockwell, using South Lambeth Road. We welcome the idea and hope relevant stakeholders move this plan forward as soon as possible, and to a high quality.
 - ii. The track on South Lambeth Road south of Fentiman Road and the design of the Fentiman Road/Miles Street junction are very unclear from drawings. Does this indicate both are part of the separate Quietway scheme? If not, can they be urgently clarified?
- d) Vauxhall Station issues...
- i. Ensure access to Vauxhall Station itself is maximised for cyclists - with cycle parking prioritised, and increased provision for transfer of bikes to trains made a priority.
 - ii. We support, as a next phase for the area, the “Our Vauxhall” (ourvauxhall.com) vision of turning South Lambeth Road into a linear park, closing it to motor vehicle traffic, as well as closing South Lambeth Place and making Durham Street two-way with calming measures. We believe these changes to the road layout would improve the area for not just cyclists, but

also pedestrians and may prove an improvement for bus users and drivers also. We request TfL to fully explore the potential of the “Our Vauxhall” ideas.

e) “Ratrun” risks...

- i. There is a concern that Bondway and Miles Street will become heavily used as a through route or “ratrun” in the new scheme, with drivers avoiding the lights. If that is the case, then it would become a more hostile space for cycling and a further modal filter or other methods to ensure vehicular traffic remains suitably slow and sparse would be welcome. There is a similar potential issue for Wyvil Road – which also has a primary school on.

f) Carriage design issues

- i. On Wandsworth Road, the placement of lane arrows just north of Miles Street risks confusion. The ahead/left arrow in the left lane is directly next to an access crossing of the segregated track, when presumably the arrow is there to indicate the appropriate lane for the left turn into Nine Elms Lane.
- ii. There should be cycle logos in the middle of the carriage on the southern half of Bondway and on Miles Street to indicate appropriate cyclists taking the “primary position” and remind drivers of presence of cyclists on this stretch of carriage.
- iii. There is a risk of cyclist-driver conflict at the junction of Bondway and Miles Street. Give way markings on Bondway would reinforce priority for cyclists travelling westbound along Miles Street.

g) Cycle parking issues...

- i. Cycle parking on Albert Embankment is located on the opposite side of the carriage from the cycle tracks and at the junction of Bondway and Parry Street is not located near any tracks. How are cyclists meant to access these facilities? Meanwhile, the cycle parking on South Lambeth Road is not located near any crossings. That means it is likely there will be less footfall at this location, and therefore natural surveillance; and cyclists face extra inconvenience to reach nearby destinations such as the station.

h) General issues...

- i. Wide cycle tracks should, in general, be well signed and ideally painted a different colour from the carriage (in a suitable, durable, non-skid paint). This is to ensure drivers do not confuse cycle tracks with parking or loading bays or carriageway.
- ii. The London Cycling Campaign would like to see all schemes given a CLoS rating (as well as adhering to the latest London Cycle Design Standards) that demonstrates significant improvement from the current layout will be achieved for cycling (current LCC policy sets out an expectation for new schemes to achieve a CLoS rating of 70 or above), and that eliminates all “critical fails” in any proposed design before being funded for construction, let alone public consultation. In the case of this scheme, that means ensuring all junctions have eliminated serious “hook” turning conflicts etc.

6 What impact do you think our proposals will have on bus users?

Positive

7 Do you have any further comments about the impact on bus users?

Improvements to the public realm and the appearance and amenity of the bus station are very welcome. Even better would be for all bus stops to be within sight of each other.

8 What impact do you think our proposals will have on cars and other motor vehicles?

Neutral

9 Do you have any further comments about the impact on cars and other motor vehicles?

While improvements the scheme makes are very welcome for the majority of users of the area, the road network that remains demonstrates how traffic dominated Vauxhall Cross will remain – despite changing the gyratory/one-way system to two-way working.

Given the very small modelled impacts on vehicle traffic, we believe the scheme could go much further in reducing vehicle traffic capacity – valuable in itself for reducing pollution etc. – and freeing up more space for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users.

10 What impact do you think our proposals will have on streets and public spaces around Vauxhall?

Very positive

11 Do you have any further comments about the impact on streets and public spaces?

We support the creation of new, and improvement of existing, public spaces in the area around the station. But again support a longer-term aim to move towards the “Our Vauxhall” (ourvauxhall.com) proposal to turn South Lambeth Road into a linear park, closing it to motor vehicle traffic, as well as closing South Lambeth Place and making Durham Street two-way with calming measures. (Making Durham Street two-way as well as Harleyford Road and Kennington Lane, as per Our Vauxhall plans, would also remove the second gyratory in the area.)

12 Do you have any general or other comments about the overall proposals?

This response is made on behalf of the London Cycling Campaign, the capital’s leading cycling organisation with more than 12,000 members and 40,000 supporters. We welcome the opportunity to comment on these plans and our response was developed with input from our relevant local borough groups and from the co-chairs of our Infrastructure Review Group.