

## **London Cycling Campaign response to Wandsworth Thessaly Road consultation**

*10 September 2019*

<https://haveyoursay.citizenspace.com/wandsworthecs/thessaly-road/>

### **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:**

- This scheme is supported, with caveats. It represents a welcome shift in approach for Wandsworth Council and should enable more people to cycle and walk in the area. However, we do wish to raise several concerns about the proposals and consultation materials.

### **Specific points about this scheme:**

- We must raise issue with the following sentence: "As motorised vehicle movements are relatively low on Thessaly Road, the proposals aim to provide safer infrastructure for more vulnerable road users." This implies that the proposals would not have come forward if motorised vehicle movements were higher. But that is precisely when this type of intervention becomes even more important.
- We welcome the provision of new and enhanced pedestrian crossings and the provision of "continuous" footways at side roads. However, the drawings do not appear to depict "continuous" or "Copenhagen" crossings at any of the side roads, labelled as such or not. For an example of one see <https://www.enjoywalthamforest.co.uk/blended-copenhagen-crossings/>. And for one with a cycle track see <https://www.cyclesheffield.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/cf-700x525.jpg> These feature the track and pavement run at level directly across the mouth of the side road.
- We would recommend that where used, continuous footways feature tightened entry/exit points to avoid enabling drivers to turn in/out at speed using the pavement/track as extra turning radius (often this can be done by using street furniture, cycle racks, planters etc. out at the main road edge). And particularly where combined with bidirectional cycle tracks, these should only be used on side roads with very low turning movements in or out, and ideally one-way. This is a particular concern with Deeley Road, which it appears likely some through motor traffic uses; and at the Sleaford Street industrial estate access just north of the train

tracks. If these junctions do feature higher than low levels of motor traffic, other designs should be used in conjunction with bidirectional tracks.

- The lack of connectivity for this scheme is concerning, particularly at the southern end, where the scheme stops prior to Wandsworth Road for no clear reason. It currently does not appear planned to connect at the southern end to any cycle scheme planned, delivered or discussed from Lambeth or TfL. For instance, it does not feature on the Strategic Cycling Analysis, or Lambeth's Healthy Routes map, nor does it connect to any routes on these maps. Onward connections at the ends should be discussed with relevant other authorities as a priority to ensure this scheme plays a useful part in the Cycleway network.
- Specifically at the southern end of the scheme more could be done to make it clear how those cycling are expected to join the cycle track, such as using a parallel crossing.
- The lack of dimensions and clarity to the diagram mean it is impossible to accurately assess carriageway lane, pavement and cycle track widths and dimensions. As below, the cycle track and pavements should be a priority for capacity, with the track width exceeding London Cycling Design Standards recommended minimums.

#### **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.