



Contacts:

Nick Davies: 07752 697187

Jon Fray: 07984 757761

Kingston@lcc.org.uk

## **Kingston Cycling Campaign's response to the Portsmouth Road consultation**

### **Mayor's Outer London Cycling Fund (mini-Holland Programme)**

February 2015

#### **Key response points:**

- The Kingston Cycling Campaign strongly objects to the design of the scheme set out in the consultation documents.
- This is Kingston's first Mini Holland scheme; it is important to set a satisfactory standard and precedent for later schemes.
- We believe that full segregation, (protected space), can be provided along the length of this route (see App 2). Connections with facilities to the north and the south need to be designed at the same time to ensure continuity.
- In the bid document it was stated this road was to get a fully segregated two way cycle track for about half its length and the remainder was to be semi-segregated. Around 70 to 80% of the carriageway length is proposed to have no protected space for cycling, rather there will be Mandatory Cycle Lanes ("white paint" as people call it).
- The proposal may be of some limited value to existing cyclists but will do very little to encourage non-cyclists, or the hesitant, to use bicycles; which is the objective of the mini-Holland programme (see App 1).
- It is not the dramatic or step change in cycling provision which the mini-Holland schemes are intended to achieve, as in the Mayor's Cycling Vision for London (see App 1).
- We met with Councillors from the Administration and without giving any promises they said they would speak to Officers about increasing segregated provision. We welcome this.
- We do not want this fantastic opportunity for our Borough to be wasted and we are confident that if aspects of the scheme are redesigned to incorporate protected space along the entirety of this short route it will prove an outstanding achievement for Kingston.

## Appendix 1 Mayor’s Vision for Cycling in London:

Source: [www.tfl.gov.uk/cdn/static/cms/documents/gla-mayors-cycle-vision-2013.pdf](http://www.tfl.gov.uk/cdn/static/cms/documents/gla-mayors-cycle-vision-2013.pdf)

These proposals pay no heed to this document. In particular they singularly fail to live up to the following objectives for the Mini Hollands in the suburbs set out on page 16;

- *“We will choose between one and three willing Outer London boroughs to make into mini-Hollands, with very high spending concentrated on these relatively small areas for the greatest possible impact. In many ways, this will be the most transformative of all our policies.”*
- *“This is a fantastic opportunity for these boroughs to achieve dramatic change – not just for cyclists, but for everyone who lives and works there.”*
- *“The idea, over time, is that these places will become every bit as cycle-friendly as their Dutch equivalents; places that suburbs and towns all over Britain will want to copy.”*

## Appendix 2: Specific Comments

Ref	Location	Issue
1	87% of the scheme	<p><b>Not enough full segregation.</b>            The proposals include approximately 13% (0.32km/2.4km) of full segregation. KCC firmly believes that more full segregation is required in order to provide a facility that would be considered safe enough by people who do not already cycle.            We recommend that alternative allocation of highway space (including the carriageway and footways) is made to provide protected space.</p> <p>KCC would favour uni-directional fully segregated with-flow cycle tracks. We believe that two-way cycle tracks (similar to those proposed for the East-West Cycle Superhighway on the Embankment) would be preferable to mandatory cycle lanes but are not our preferred option. We acknowledge that segregated cycle tracks need additional margins beside them for buffers and obstacles.</p> <p>It is evident that throughout the majority of Portsmouth Road with which this scheme is concerned there is space for a 2m uni-directional with-flow fully segregated cycle track, a buffer (0.5m) and a 3m motor carriageway plus a 2m footway on the eastern side (total width 13m). On the Northern (roughly north of Surbiton Road) and Centre section there is no requirement for a footway on the western side.</p>

		<p>There is space for a 1.5m footway on the western side of the southern section, (roughly south of Grove Road), where there is no option for pedestrians to use Queens Promenade in addition to 2m cycle tracks, buffers and a 3m carriageway.</p> <p>There is a short centre section from south of Surbiton Road to a point between Anglesea and Palace Roads where achieving full segregation will be challenging because of lack of space. This section is only about 250m long. Here the cycle tracks, carriageway and footway may all need to be reduced (say to 1.5m, 2.75m and 1.5m respectively) to achieve full segregation but it can be done. It would be a sad waste to compromise the usability of the scheme because of the challenges this section presents. Where space is tight, stepped kerbs may be an alternative.</p> <p>See Appendix 3 for measurements we have made.</p>
2		<p><b>Not enough information supplied.</b>  RBK has not provided any information about how many vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians use the Portsmouth Road. No information about the speed of traffic has been provided. We have not, despite repeated requests, been supplied with copies of the plans of the proposed scheme.  We want RBK to provide information on traffic conditions. This would allow a 'Cycling Level of Service' (CLOS) to be identified for this road and what type of changes would be required to have an excellent CLOS.  According to the London Cycling Design Standards Chapter 2 fig. 2.3 table the 'Cycling Level of Service' in the proposed scheme may well be no better than 'Basic' and possibly 'critical' based on the 'Feeling of Safety' Factor, as the cycle lanes, in places are less than 2m, and on the following assumptions (we have no figures):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 85th percentile traffic speed greater than 25mph</li> <li>• 500-1,000 vehicles per hour where cyclists not separated</li> </ul> <p>That is extremely poor for a "step change" mini-Holland scheme.</p>
3		<p><b>Removal of road centre line.</b>  We understand that removal of centrelines in other schemes has achieved a reduction in average vehicle speeds and for that reason we are in favour of this change.</p>
4	Footway	<p><b>Removal of Footway</b>  The footway on the western side of the northern and centre sections is very little used for the obvious reason that pedestrians prefer the more pleasant Queens Promenade or</p>

		the eastern footway if they want access to the homes, side roads and buildings on that side. Accordingly the footway on the western side of the northern and centre sections can be wholly or largely dispensed with. In the absence of proper plans we cannot tell to what extent it is proposed the western footway be narrowed.
5	East side of Portsmouth Road by St Raphael's Church	<b>Single yellow lines will still permit obstructive parking.</b> We are concerned that single yellow line controls will continue to apply in the vicinity of St Raphael's Church. Parking on this section would prohibit use of the cycle facilities. St Raphael's has a car park and there are side streets where parking is permitted, subject to controls. Parking should not be permitted on the Portsmouth Road where it would block the cycle facility.
6	Junction with South Lane	<b>Reduction of junction width travelling southbound.</b> The large mouth of this junction has long been a danger to cyclists heading southbound because some drivers cut left across cyclists. We approve of the plan to reduce the mouth of this junction.
7		<b>Consultation bias.</b> There are only three questions (3a, 3b & 3c) on the consultation form specifically about the proposed facilities. None refer to the 87% of the route that would not be fully segregated. The council should not take support for the segregated section as being support for the scheme as a whole.
8	Along the route	<b>5 additional new zebra crossings</b> Five additional zebra crossings are proposed bringing the total of zebras to 8 on this road which is approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile long. This could increase the number of times a person on a bike has to stop on this route, making it unattractive to use. Obviously there is a need for access to and from Queens Promenade but this provision seems excessive.
9	Connectivity of route	<b>Cycle route must connect from Market Place to the Borough Boundary</b> No attempt has been made by the designers to show how the Portsmouth Road scheme will connect with the section to the south of the Brighton Road towards the boundary with Elmbridge, nor how it would connect with route(s) to the north into the High Street and the proposed Cycle Boardway. We believe that a more integrated approach should be taken to avoid the pitfall of designing a facility that does not work with an adjacent junction or scheme.
10	Near Anglesea Road and Surbiton Road	<b>2 new access points</b> There are existing access points to Queens Promenade near Palace Road, Catherine Road, Uxbridge Road, Grove Road, Woodbines Avenue, South Lane. We have no objection to increased access in itself, but consider that the

		cost of providing this might not be justifiable.
11	Throughout the scheme	<b>Surfacing</b> A machine-laid surface is much better i.e. less bumpy/rolling than a hand-laid surface. The evidence is that cyclists much prefer smooth surfaces. Attention should be paid to provide smooth cycle tracks.
12	Throughout the scheme	<b>Speed limit</b> A 30 mph speed limit is not appropriate on a road that does not have fully segregated cycle tracks. If full segregation is not provided the speed limit needs to be reduced to 20mph.
13	Beside western footway	<b>Retention of spike-topped railings</b> The railings on the side of the western footway are presumably required to prevent people falling. We question whether the spikes which could cause injury need to be retained.
14		<b>Lanterns hidden in trees</b> In places along the route the street lighting is hidden in the trees. This should be addressed by moving the lamp columns or cutting tree growth.

### Appendix 3: Measurements of Portsmouth Road

All measurements in metres (m)	West footway	Carriageway	East footway	Sum	Cycle lane
Crossing by Anglers	2.0	10.4	2.0	14.4	1.3
Zebra by Woodbines	2.1	10.0	2.5	14.6	
Near café	2.1	7.6	1.9	11.6	
St Raphael's	2.2	7.3	1.5	11.0	
Anglesea Road	2.3	8.0	2.2	12.5	1.3
Zebra at car wash	2.2	9.7	2.7	14.6	
Catherine Road	2.5	9.3	2.1	13.9	
Cadogan Road	2.5	10.3	2.6	15.4	2.0m incl. hatching
Westfield Road	2.5	9.5	2.5	14.5	
Seething Wells boundary	2.4	9.3	2.2	13.9	

**END**