Responses to QW&7 consultations, from North to South:

## Calton Avenue

* Support: no
* Traffic islands with footway buildouts: N/A [**Confirmation please]**
* Double yellow at junctions: yes
* Double yellow on Court Lane: yes
* Double yellow sourth-west of Gilker Crescent and the introduction of loading bay outside of shops: yes **[Confirmation please]**
* New zebra: yes
* Marked parking bays: N/A [**Confirmation please]**
* Removal of centre-line road marking: yes

Comments:

We support the removal of traffic islands, since they create dangerous pinch points for cyclists. We do not support their replacement with build-outs, which similarly narrow the road, unless sufficiently wide cycle bypasses are provided. These bypasses must not be blocked by parked cars at either end, and must be kept clear of debris. We are in favour of more actual pedestrian crossings (e.g. zebras) where possible.

We think that these changes will make the road more pleasant for existing cyclists. However, we do not think they are sufficient to induce a step-change in the number of people choosing to cycle. The intimidation factor of many impatient drivers is only slightly mitigated by the removal of traffic islands.

According to LB Southwark traffic count data, Carlton Avenue saw an average of 2225PCU southbound and 3206PCU northbound per day. Traffic volumes need to be reduced to less than 2,000 PCU per day, and 85th percentile speeds need to be under 20mph for this route to be considered a “quiet” way.

According to the Cycle Strategy, “We will ensure our designs are suitable for all ages and abilities and will test infrastructure, including cycle parking, to ensure it is fit for purpose.” Will Southwark be happy to send 8-year-olds alone down this route unaccompanied, to test it out? If not, then it is not fit for purpose.

## Dulwich Village Junction

* Support: yes
* Staggered pedestrian crossings: n/a
* Segregated cycle facility: yes
* Removal of guardrail: yes
* Widening of footways: yes
* Change of priority: yes
* Court Lane junction layout: yes
* Banned left turn: yes

Comments:

The change of priority will make Court Lane junction much less confusing for cyclists using the Quietway, particularly those who have not cycled here before.

We strongly support the separate cycle signals. The junction as it currently exists is very intimidating for new cyclists, those with children, etc, and this change will be both objectively and subjectively safer.

## Turney Road

* Support: no
* Traffic islands for buildouts: N/A or yes? [**Comments needed]**
* Double yellow at junctions: yes
* Double yellow east of Croxted road: [**Comments needed]**
* New zebra: yes
* Parking bays: ? **[Comments needed]**
* Removal of centre-linke marking: yes
* Pedestrian improvements at Burbage Road: yes
* Extra road humps: yes

Comments:

We support the extra road humps, with the proviso that they should be sinusoidal humps, to make cycling comfortable, particularly for e.g. the elderly. We do not support cushions, as these require very careful road positioning for cyclists, making journeys more stressful. In particular, cushions can be problematic with non-standard cycles, such as those used by disabled cyclists or parents carrying children.

We support the removal of traffic islands, since they create dangerous pinch points for cyclists. We do not support their replacement with build-outs, which similarly narrow the road, unless sufficiently wide cycle bypasses are provided. These bypasses must not be blocked by parked cars at either end, and must be kept clear of debris.

In particular, this could be achieved east of the junction with Croxted Road, where there is no parking either side of the build-out. If necessary, this could reduce Turney Road to a single lane for a few metres, which would help to reduce both the volume and speed of traffic along this route.

We think that these changes will make the road more pleasant for existing cyclists. However, we do not think they are sufficient to induce a step-change in the number of people choosing to cycle. The intimidation factor of many impatient drivers is only very slightly mitigated by the removal of traffic islands and improved sightlines at junctions.

Traffic volumes need to be reduced to less than 2,000 PCU per day, and 85th percentile speeds need to be under 20mph.

According to the Cycle Strategy, “We will ensure our designs are suitable for all ages and abilities and will test infrastructure, including cycle parking, to ensure it is fit for purpose.” Will Southwark be happy to send 8-year-olds alone down this route unaccompanied, to test it out? If not, then it is not fit for purpose.