

## **LONDON BOROUGH OF RICHMOND UPON THAMES**

**DATE:** AUGUST 2015

**DECISION MAKER:** Cabinet Member for Highways & Streetscene

**LEAD OFFICER:** Highway Infrastructure Manager

**SUBJECT:** PROPOSED CYCLING IMPROVEMENTS IN LONDON ROAD, TWICKENHAM BETWEEN JUNCTIONS WITH A316 CHERTSEY ROAD & WHITTON ROAD

**WARDS:** St Margarets & North Twickenham

**KEY DECISION?:** NO

**IF YES, IN FORWARD PLAN?:** NO

For general release

### **1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

- 1.1 A public consultation was undertaken in June 2015 on proposed cycling improvements for London Road, Twickenham. The report summarises the responses and in light of the concerns raised seeks approval for officers to consider alternative designs and/or routes as appropriate.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.2 The Council has made a bid for funding from Transport for London (TfL) to improve cycling facilities on London Road. This scheme forms part of wider proposals to provide a continuous cycle route between the A316 (London Road junction) and Twickenham Green via Twickenham Town centre. An initial public consultation was undertaken to see if there was in principle support for the scheme before any detailed design and a further consultation is undertaken. As the scheme was poorly supported then alternatives need to be considered.

### **2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 **It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Highways & Street Scene:**

- i. **Notes the consultation responses;**
- ii. **In light of the responses received, subject to Transport for London (TfL) funding, officers to revise proposals and/or consider alternative cycle routes as set out in paragraph 4.3 of the report.**

### 3. DETAIL

- 3.1 The Council has made a bid for funding from Transport for London (TfL) to improve cycling facilities within the Borough. This is in response to the Mayor of London's commitment to transform cycling in London by making the streets as safe and inviting for cycling as they are in continental Europe.
- 3.2 The scheme forms part of wider proposals to provide a continuous cycle route between the A316 (London Road junction) and Twickenham Green via Twickenham Town centre.
- 3.3 Preliminary/feasibility designs were drawn up and shown on plan **2326-CS-GL-001** attached at Annex B.

On the eastern side of London Road it is proposed to introduce a two-way cycle track between the A316 Chertsey Road and London Road. The improvements will require the London Road carriageway to be narrowed and require several CPZ parking bays to be relocated.

The following changes were proposed (refer to the relevant section on the attached plan):

- Existing shared cycle and pedestrian areas will be extended where there is insufficient width to provide a separate cycle track. Existing shared cycle and pedestrian areas will be repaved as part of Twickenham Town Centre improvement works (section A);
  - Shared cycle and pedestrian areas will be provided at bus stops (section B);
  - The existing CPZ parking bays on the western side of London Road would become footway parking bays (section B). Additional CPZ bays will be provided to replace those lost on the eastern side of London Road (section B);
  - Double yellow/At Any Time waiting restrictions would replace existing single yellow line restrictions along the remainder of London Road. These would discourage parking but not prevent occasional loading/unloading of deliveries (section C);
  - Existing traffic islands originally provided to reduce traffic speeds will be removed. The proposed road narrowing is expected to have a similar traffic calming effect (section C);
  - Consideration will be given to removing the existing the road centre-line as a traffic calming measure (section C);
  - Warning signage will be placed on side roads to alert drivers of the two way cycle track on London Road (section C)
- 3.3 It was decided that an early consultation would be appropriate to gauge the level of support for the proposed improvements. In the event of minimal support and the scheme was not progressed this would save abortive design work.

### 4. CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT

- 4.1 A consultation letter/plan was delivered to London Road frontagers and surrounding residential streets in June 2015 with a one month's consultation

period. Letters/plans were also circulated to cyclists on street and the Richmond Cycling Campaign publicised the consultation on their website.

The consultation was also put on the Council's website and electronic responses were requested via the website. The results are reported at Appendix A.

#### 4.2 There was strong opposition to the scheme with the main concerns being:

- The majority of those responding to the consultation, irrespective of whether they supported the proposals, were concerned about the loss of the existing pedestrian refuges. The speed and volume of traffic makes crossing London Road difficult, especially for the elderly and those with children.

Officers had anticipated that at least one formal pedestrian crossing would have to be provided as part of the detailed design. However, it would not be practicable to replace the 3 existing pedestrian refuges with formal crossing points;

- The eastern footway is the most heavily used and the proposed narrowing of the footway may encourage pedestrians to enter the cycle track potentially coming into conflict with passing cyclists;
- The potential high risk of conflict at shared cycle and pedestrian areas adjacent to bus stops;
- The potential high risk of conflict between cyclists and motor vehicles entering and leaving side roads and vehicle cross-overs. Even if priority was clearly marked it was considered that right turning drivers had to check whether it was safe to cross the cycle track before considering if it was safe to enter the traffic lanes on London Road;
- How convenient would a 2 way facility on one side of the road be? For some journeys it would provide a seamless facility but for other journeys it could result in one or more crossings of London Road. It was suggested that a with-flow cycle facility on each side of London Road probably offered the most convenient and attractive solution for cyclists. This would be enhanced if a safe pedestrian and cycle crossing was provided by Transport for London (TfL) on London Road immediately south of the A316 Chertsey Road.

This solution would probably allow the existing pedestrian refuge islands to be retained.

- Any narrowing of the London Road carriageway would lead to greater traffic congestion when occasional deliveries take place.

#### 4.3 Based on the consultation results officers to revise proposals and/or consider alternative cycle routes as set out below:

- An alternative scheme that provides a with flow cycle lane/track on each side of London Road. This could include some form of 'lighter'

segregation that would separate cyclists from motor vehicles using dividing strips and/or bollards;

- How the existing 'quiet' cycle route along Cole Park Road could be better promoted and what, if any, improvements are required.

## **5. FINANCE AND EFFICIENCY IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 Any further design work will be subject to Transport for London (TfL) funding being secured.

## **6. PROCUREMENT IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 Not applicable

## **7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 Any changes to waiting and loading restrictions would be subject to a separate statutory public consultation.

## **8. BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

None

## **9. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None

## **10. CONTACTS**

The person who can answer questions on the report:

Robert Parsey  
Senior Engineer  
Telephone 0208 487 5284  
Email [robert.parsey@richmond.gov.uk](mailto:robert.parsey@richmond.gov.uk)

Michael Gilroy  
Highway Infrastructure Manager  
Telephone 0208 891 7115  
Email [michael.gilroy@richmond.gov.uk](mailto:michael.gilroy@richmond.gov.uk)

Cabinet Member Cllr Stephen Speak  
Cabinet Member for Highways & Streetscene  
Email [Cllr.SSpeak@richmond.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.SSpeak@richmond.gov.uk)

## Appendix A – London Road

### Consultation Results

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the outline proposals to improve cycling in London Road between junctions with A316 Chertsey Road and Whitton Road?

Total response 115 replies. (Questionnaires distributed 583 – 19% response rate)

<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neither Agree/ Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>No Return</b>
<b>22 (19%)</b>	<b>11 (10%)</b>	<b>7 (6%)</b>	<b>15 (13%)</b>	<b>60 (52%)</b>	<b>0</b>

<b>Summary of consultation response</b>	<b>Officer response</b>
<p><b><u>Use of London Road as a cycle route</u></b></p> <p>Why not consider using Cole Park Road as a quiet alternative?</p>	<p>Cole Park Road currently forms part of a 'quiet' cycle route, although it would appear that most cyclists use London Road in preference. Consideration could be given to better direction signage and what, if any, other improvements may be appropriate.</p>
<p><b><u>Parking &amp; loading restrictions</u></b></p> <p>The loss of on-street parking on single yellow lines during the evenings and weekends is not welcomed.</p> <p>Once again the Council will not consider the loss of any on-street parking even when it would improve traffic flow on a main road.</p>	<p>The decision to propose removal of on-street parking was not taken lightly but was required to keep traffic on the road free-running at all times.</p> <p>The Council has to balance the competing demands on streets within the borough.</p>
<p><b><u>Design Elements</u></b></p> <p>2.5 metre wide cycle tracks not wide enough for two way use.</p> <p>Some confusion as to what a junction entry treatment is and how it would benefit road users.</p> <p>The eastern pavement is the more heavily used – why are</p>	<p>The design looked to maximise the width of the cycle track and 2.5 metres was the maximum consistent width that could be provided (NB within the cycle track a 300-500mm 'safety margin' would have to be provided to separate cyclists and vehicles on the adjacent carriageway.</p> <p>Junction entry treatments are designed to slow the speed of vehicles entering side roads. The carriageway is raised to footway level and the corners are tightened to reduce the speed that vehicles can turn the corner. This helps both pedestrians and cyclists when crossing side roads.</p> <p>The main reason for placing the cycle track on the eastern side of the road is that it</p>

you intending to narrow it? Could you not put the cycle track on the western side where there are less pedestrians.

Cannot see how northbound cyclists will use the facility as potentially they may have to cross London Road twice to complete their journey along London Road – most will continue to stay on the road

With flow mandatory cycle lanes would be more useful/convenient. These clearly have priority over traffic emerging from side roads

Do not welcome pavement parking – it detracts from the residential area and some of the landmark buildings. It will increase damage to vehicles tyres and wing mirrors prone to being clipped where road narrows.

How will this proposal impact on mature street trees?

The money would be better spent on maintaining roads to a good standard.

provided a direct connection into the A316 Toucan crossing by Cole Park Road. It also provided the best connection into Twickenham Railway Station and the cycle routes in the town centre generally.

There are several mature street trees on the western (footway) of London Road and these reduce the footway widths and limit the options for providing a cycle track on this side of the road.

It is accepted that for some potential journeys the two-way track may not be as convenient as staying on the road. Consideration to be given to an alternative scheme that provides a with flow cycle lane/track on each side of London Road. This could include some form of 'lighter' segregation from motor vehicles using raised dividing strips and/or bollards.

Such a solution would be enhanced by with the installation of a pedestrian and cycle crossing provided by TfL on London Road immediately south of the A316 Chertsey Road.

See answer above.

Pavement parking was proposed as a compromise to retain as much on-street parking as possible. It would be possible to install kerbs with a chamfered edge so that vehicles would not have to bump up the kerb.

The scheme will have no effect on the existing street trees.

Any cycling improvements will be funded from ring-fenced TfL cycling budgets over and above those secured for highways maintenance.

**Congestion & traffic speed**

Narrowing of the London Road carriageway will cause more traffic congestion and repeat the mistakes of the Town Centre (non) improvement works. Have the views of the emergency services been sought?

Currently there is a 2 two lane informal approach to the A316 London Road Roundabout (northbound) – narrowing the road will extend the length of queues.

The narrowing of London Road will mean that occasional deliveries will cause congestion.

There is not a problem for cyclists when the traffic is freeflowing – it’s more of a problem when traffic stationery and some cars pull very close to the kerb

Calming of traffic, particularly that leaving the A316 is more important, why not erect signs showing that there is a 30mph speed limit? Consideration should be given to introducing a 20mph speed limit

Narrowing of the carriageway does not necessarily cause congestion. It is not proposed to reduce the number of traffic lanes on the approach to major junctions so there should not affect the junction capacity. The proposals were shared with the emergency services and TfL London Buses.

Accepted. Any future scheme will look to maintain a 2 lane approach to the roundabout give-way lines. Although the length of the 2 lane approach may be reduced this should not affect the capacity of the junction,

Accepted. Consideration could be given to introducing loading restrictions to prevent loading/unloading at the busiest times.

If an on-road cycle lane is provide with some form of segregation this will discourage/prevent vehicles from pulling up close to the kerb and blocking access for cyclists.

It is Department for Transport national policy that in areas with street lighting it should be assumed that the speed limit is 30mph, unless there are signs to the contrary. The speeds on London Road are too high to introduce a 20mph speed limit without physical traffic calming measures.

**Conflict**

Some respondents question whether off-road cycle routes are advantageous. In some instances drivers feel that cyclists should be obligated to use the facilities provided.

Concerns that shared cycle and pedestrian use paths proposed at the northern/southern extents of the scheme

Cyclists are not obliged to use off-road cycle facilities and can continue to use the carriageway. This can lead to conflict/antagonism particularly if cyclists continue to use the carriageway and potentially ‘hold up’ vehicular traffic.

The extended shared cycle and pedestrian use areas are relatively minor



<p>would increase conflict between pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Concerns about potential conflict at bus stops between pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Who has priority at side road junctions and vehicle cross-overs is not clear enough and this may lead to conflict between cyclists and vehicles?</p> <p>Even with priority clearly marked there is a risk of conflict between cyclists and motor vehicles entering and leaving side roads and vehicle cross-overs.</p> <p>Right turning drivers (eastern side of London Road) have to first check that it is safe to cross the 2 way cycle track before considering if it is safe to enter the general traffic lanes.</p> <p>Drivers leaving side roads and off-road car parking will block cycle track.</p> <p>Removal of pedestrian refuges without replacing them alternative crossing points was strongly resisted.</p>	<p>extensions of existing shared use areas. They have been proposed where there is insufficient width to provide a dedicated cycle facility and to provide a continuous cycle route.</p> <p>Accepted that the proposals at bus stops were a compromise. The higher risk of conflict is for those alighting from buses not being aware that they are entering a shared cycle and pedestrian area. There is insufficient width to divert the cycle track behind bus stops. It was anticipated that if the scheme progressed to detailed design then this would be an area where further consideration would be given to providing a safe 'landing area' for bus passengers.</p> <p>It was anticipated that if the scheme progressed to detailed design that further consideration would be given as to what, if any, additional lines/signs/side road entry treatments/contrasting surfacing would be required to clearly indicate to all users who has priority.</p> <p>It is accepted that the proposed layout would require greater care by drivers and cyclists joining London Road. Ideally at side road turnings the cycle track would be 'bent' away from London Road by several metres. This would further reduce the risk of conflict/obstruction caused by vehicles leaving side roads. Unfortunately there is insufficient highway width to do this on London Road.</p> <p>See answer above.</p> <p>The majority of those responding to the consultation, irrespective of whether they supported the proposals, raised serious concerns about the loss of the pedestrian refuges. It was anticipated that at the detailed design stage that a least one formal</p>
---	---

<p>The provision of a safe crossing point of London Road on the south side of the A316 is a priority.</p>	<p>pedestrian crossings would have to be provided. It would not be practicable to replace the 3 existing crossing points with formal crossing points</p> <p>The A316 Chertsey Road forms part of the Transport for London Road Network. Transport for London (TfL) remain responsible for managing the road and they are currently considering improvements to the A316 London Road roundabout. They are aware of the need to provide safe and convenient crossing points of London Road immediately south of the A316.</p>
<p><b><u>More roadworks</u></b></p> <p>Will cause more delays/disruption whilst works undertaken</p>	<p>It is accepted that the construction of the scheme would cause some disruption.</p>