

Wandsworth Priory Lane

16 February 2018

<https://haveyoursay.citizenspace.com/wandsworthecs/priory-lane/>

This consultation response is on behalf of the London Cycling Campaign (LCC), the capital's leading cycling organisation with more than 12,000 members and 30,000 supporters. This response was developed with input from representatives of LCC's borough groups.

This scheme is opposed. The current cycling infrastructure in this location is far below any appropriate standard. But this proposal worsens some aspects of it, and will not enable more people to cycle in this location. Indeed, this proposal could easily reduce the number of people willing to cycle in this location.

Specific points about the scheme:

- Priory Lane is marked as a route of high cycling potential on TfL's Strategic Cycling Analysis, and connects to one of the corridors marked as among the top 25 highest at its northern end. Given 1,000 cyclists a day already use the Lane, and the aims of the Mayor's Transport Strategy, any scheme brought forward must plan for major growth in cycling at this location, and a wider range of people choosing to cycle here, including many who don't currently cycle. Given this, it is imperative this scheme is designed to either radically reduce motor traffic volumes and speeds on this road, or to provide physical separation for those cycling from motor vehicle traffic, along the length of the Lane.
- There is no good reason why through motor vehicle traffic should be enabled in a park such as Richmond Park. Driving in such parks should be discouraged as much as possible, or at the least limited to access to car parking, servicing. This is one of the key problems with Priory Lane. And the first priority for it, and the Richmond Park area should be to reduce motor traffic volumes by removing through motor traffic from the park and redirecting it to more suitable roads.
- The volume of traffic on this road, particularly when combined with its straightness, will ensure that the vast majority of people will not cycle along this road without physical separation from motor traffic, even if that motor traffic can be successfully brought to 20mph. Therefore even the current hugely substandard cycle track would likely enable more people to cycle this route than the proposal – families, children and others will not cycle this proposal. Over 1,000 cyclists daily use this route. And this proposal may well worsen conditions for many of them.
- If through motor traffic is not to be removed from the park, Priory Lane could be modally filtered at a suitable point to remove through motor traffic from the Lane. Or, although a far inferior solution, Priory Lane could be made one way, with one lane, freeing up space to

provide more appropriate space for cycling and walking along it.

- The footway of 2m is welcome. As is the proposal to install speed humps and raised tables. And the removal of the mini-roundabout. However even for walking, further improvements are required, such as tightening the geometry of many of the side road turnings and the turns onto/off the roads at either end. This would reduce crossing distances and slow drivers. For many of these roads, “continuous footways” should be considered as an even better answer.

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 issues” eliminated.