

Response ID ANON-P93D-7CJJ-E

Submitted to **Have your say on Cycle Superhighway Route 4 from Tower Bridge to Greenwich**

Submitted on **2017-11-17 20:35:51**

Our overall proposals

1 Do you support the overall proposals?

Strongly support

2 Do you have any comments on the overall proposals?

Comments on the overall proposals :

This response is on behalf of Southwark Cyclists, the London Cycling Campaign Group for the Borough of Southwark. It has been prepared with input from many of our members. Detailed comments are restricted to the Southwark sections 1-4.

General Comments

1. It is great to see CS4 at Consultation and with a design that meets many of our aspirations. A segregated path from Tower Bridge Road to Lower Rd with safer routes past all major junctions. We hope that plans for the Surrey Quays Gyratory will go to consultation before the end of 2017. Without an equally high quality route through the Gyratory the Southwark part of CS4 will lose much of its value. It is also our hope that detailed plans for the section from Tower Bridge Rd to London Bridge will be published in 2018.
2. Numbers. Key to the success of this route will be making it good enough to cope with likely cycling numbers. Present peak unidirectional flows are 1100 cyclists per hour. This has risen steadily from 630 per hour in 2012. The trip rate of 3500 total for cyclists on the A200 given in the consultation information is very out of date. It will be at least 6000 now and possibly 7-8000. The Mayor hopes to increase cycling by at least 2-fold over the next decade. Given this ambition, and the steady growth over recent years, this route needs to accommodate peak flows of at least 2000/hour.
3. Lane widths. The London Cycling Design Standards recommend at least 4m for bidirectional paths with high cycle flows. Note that even at peak flow, there is still a 14% flow in the opposite direction. Our counts show that going with the main flow will still be passing one cyclist every 15 sec in the opposite direction. The consultation states the lane will be 3-4m in width. 3m is not enough. As the drawings are not to scale it is impossible to judge how much of the path is 3m. There is usually some central reservation that could be removed and on other places quite wide pavements. In line with the LCDS, the Southwark sections of CS4 must be at least 4m throughout. If they are not, CS4 will fail to cope with the expected numbers of cyclists. This will put people off trying to cycle and so make it difficult to achieve the Mayor's ambition of getting a lot more people cycling.
4. It is unfortunate that 4 aspects of the plan are detrimental to motor traffic but are irrelevant to CS4. These are the 1-way schemes for Shad Thames and Cathay St, the bus gate at Rotherhithe roundabout and the no-entry at Marigold St. These features should not have been in the CS4 consultation. They should have been dealt with in separate consultations that could look at the merits of each. Much of the response to the consultation will be determined by these features. We hope, in analyzing responses, TfL will separate out those that deal with CS4, and those that deal with these irrelevant add-ons. It would be straightforward to build CS4 without any of these 4 changes.
5. Some small suggestions:
 - a. St James Road. It must be possible for cyclists to enter and exit CS4 safely at St James Rd. As proposed for Abbey St, the traffic lights need an extra stage. St James Rd is a popular route for cyclists as it runs directly to the Old Kent Rd.
 - b. If the Shad Thames 1-way is brought in, then a cycle contraflow is needed for south/east bound cyclists. This is the National Cycle Route 4 alignment and is popular with cyclists (about 14% of cyclists at Dockhead use this route).

Our proposals by section

3 Do you support the proposals for Tooley Street/Tower Bridge Road?

Strongly support

Do you have any comments on the proposals for Tooley St/ Tower Bridge Road? :

4 Do you support the proposals for Jamaica Road/Bevington Street?

Strongly support

Do you have any comments on the proposals for Jamaica Road / Bevington Street? :

As noted in the general comments, need access between CS4 and St James Rd. This is a more popular route than Abbey St. We need the same arrangement as at Abbey St, i.e. a separate green stage on the lights to allow cyclists to move safely between CS4 and St James Rd.

5 Do you support the proposals for Jamaica Road/Southwark Park Road?

Strongly support

Do you have any comments on the proposals for Jamaica Road/Southwark Park Road? :

6 Do you support the proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout?

Strongly support

Do you have any comments on the proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout? :

7 Do you support the proposals for Evelyn Street/Oxestalls Road?

Support

Do you have any comments on the proposals for Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road? :

8 Do you support the proposals for Evelyn Street/Abinger Grove?

Strongly support

Do you have any comments on the proposals for Evelyn Street / Abinger Grove? :

9 Do you support the proposals for Evelyn Street/Deptford High Street?

Strongly support

Do you have any comments on the proposals for Evelyn Street / Deptford High Street? :

10 Do you support the proposals for Creek Road/Deptford Church Street?

Strongly support

Do you have any comments on the proposals for Creek Road / Deptford Church Street? :

11 Do you support the proposals for Creek Road/Norway Street?

Strongly support

Do you have any comments on the proposals for – Creek Road / Norway Street? :

About you

12 What is your name?

Name:

Bruce Lynn

13 What is your email address?

Email:

b.lynn@ucl.ac.uk

14 Please provide us with your postcode.

Postcode:

SE1 2YP

15 Are you? (please tick all boxes that apply)

A local resident

Other:

16 How do you travel through the area? (please tick all boxes that apply)

Private car, Bus, Cycle, Walk/Wheelchair, Train

Other:

17 If responding on behalf of an organisation, business or campaign group, please provide us with a name:

Organisation:

Southwark Cyclists

18 How did you find out about this consultation?

Social media

Other:

19 What do you think about the quality of this consultation (for example, the information we have provided, any printed material you have received, any maps or plans, the website and questionnaire etc.)

Good

Do you have any further comments about the quality of the consultation material?:

It would be helpful to have (a) drawings with dimensions and (b) details of the signal stages and probable timings.