

Item No. 17.	Classification: Open	Date: 29 September 2014	Meeting Name: Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council
Report title:		Quietway Cycling Proposals	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		Chaucer and Cathedrals	
From:		Head of Public Realm	

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council comment upon the following recommendations that are due to be made to the cabinet member for regeneration, planning, and transport regarding the quietway cycling proposals for sites H to M :

Site	Recommendation
Site H – Rothsay Street	<p>i) Section A (Eastern Section of Rothsay Street between Alice Street and Tower Bridge Road)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although 57.5% of respondents objected to the proposals, in light of there being minimal traffic flow on Rothsay Street in peak periods that will have a negligible impact on Alice Street and Green Walk, and the very short nature of the proposed diversion, and the Council's desire to see a 'step-change' in levels of provision for cycling particularly on key routes such as this, it is recommended that this element of the scheme is progressed to implementation. <p>ii) Section B (Western Section of Rothsay Street and Law Street / Weston Street / Wilds Rents Junction)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is recommended that the proposals consulted upon for Section B are progressed to implementation.
Site I – Tabard Street	Due to the majority of respondents supporting the scheme and Southwark's on-going commitment to improve and promote cycling in the borough, it is recommended that the scheme proceed to implementation.

<p style="text-align: center;">Site J – Globe Street and Trinity Street</p>	<p>i) Globe Street (Between Trinity Street and Great Dover Street)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the majority of respondents supporting the scheme proposals for Globe Street and Southwark’s on-going commitment to improve and promote cycling in the borough, it is recommended that the scheme proceed to implementation. <p>ii) Trinity Street (Existing carriageway barrier to west of Globe Street)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the comments received from key cycling group stakeholders regarding accessibility and potential obstruction of disabled cyclists, it is proposed that the barrier either side of the carriageway gates on Trinity Street are removed and replaced with bollards. This will be done experimentally and monitored using ANPR cameras over period of 6 months.
<p style="text-align: center;">Site K – Borough High Street junction and Great Suffolk Street</p>	<p>Due to the majority of respondents supporting the scheme and Southwark’s on-going commitment to improve and promote cycling in the borough, it is recommended that the scheme proceed to implementation.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Site L – Great Suffolk Street / Southwark Bridge Road junction</p>	<p>Due to the majority of respondents supporting the scheme and Southwark’s on-going commitment to improve and promote cycling in the borough, it is recommended that the scheme proceed to implementation.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Site M – Webber Street and Blackfriars Road junction</p>	<p>Due to the majority of respondents supporting the scheme and Southwark’s on-going commitment to improve and promote cycling in the borough, it is recommended that the scheme proceed to implementation</p>

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. In accordance with Part 3H paragraph 19 and 21 of the Southwark constitution, community councils are to be consulted on the detail of strategic parking/traffic/safety schemes. In practice this is carried out following public consultation.
3. The community council is now being given opportunity to make final representations to the cabinet member following public consultation.
4. Further information on the consultation process, results and recommendations for each site can be referenced using the following table:

	Report Reference	Report Title
Site H	Appendix 1	Site H Consultation Report
Site I	Appendix 2	Site I Consultation Report
Site J	Appendix 3	Site J Consultation Report
Site K	Appendix 4	Site K Consultation Report
Site L	Appendix 5	Site L Consultation Report
Site M	Appendix 6	Site M Consultation Report

5. The cabinet member for regeneration, planning, and transport supports the principle of the route subject to the outcome of public consultation.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

6. Informal public consultation took place with all residents and businesses within the consultation area from 5 August 2014, with a return deadline of the 5 September, allowing 4 weeks for the consultation period. However due to the summer holiday period, responses were accepted online until 12 September 2014.
7. The consultation results are summarised as follows:

Site	Distribution no.	Replies	Response Rate	Support	Opposed	No Opinion
H	462	72	15%	29	41	2
				40%	57%	3%
I	511	22	4%	13	7	2
				59%	32%	9%
J	302	45	15%	26	16	3
				57.50%	35.50%	7%
K	383	34	9%	20	11	3
				59%	32%	9%
L	343	38	11%	27	11	0
				71%	29%	0%
M	866	52	6%	42	10	0
				81%	19%	0%

8. The below table summarises the key objections to the scheme and officer response for each site :

Site H	Objection	Response
	The proposals will be detrimental for anyone trying to drive out of Rothsay Street, as Green Walk and Alice Street are very narrow and difficult to traverse.	Whilst Green Walk and Alice Street are narrow adjacent to existing parking bays, there are sections of carriageway that have been designed as waiting areas to allow for oncoming traffic to pass a vehicle travelling in the opposite direction.

<p>The cycle route will create a lot of noise for residents and is a waste of tax payers money.</p>	<p>Cycling does not result in an increase in ambient noise levels or levels of pollution. The council welcomes significant investment from Transport for London to take forward the Quietway programme.</p>
<p>It is already dangerous turning out of Rothsay Street into Tower Bridge Road and it is even more dangerous turning out of Green Walk.</p>	<p>There are adequate sightlines for vehicles exiting Green Walk into Tower Bridge Road. The operation of a pelican crossing facility at the roundabout also provides gaps in northbound traffic on Tower Bridge Road so vehicles can safely exit Green Walk.</p>
<p>The proposals will increase traffic past residential properties in Alice Street and Green Walk, which will be detrimental safety and environmental impact on residents.</p>	<p>Traffic counts in peak periods undertaken by Transport for London show that the traffic turning out of Rothsay Street is minimal. Therefore the additional eastbound traffic that will traverse down Alice Street and Green walk will be minimal and there is no direct impact on the safety of pedestrians or amenity of local residents.</p>
<p>Alice Street regularly becomes impassable due to delivery vehicles at the gates to the Jam Factory.</p>	<p>Double yellow line parking prohibitions at the junction of Green Walk and Alice Street should prevent discriminately parked vehicles. It is illegal to parking across a pedestrian dropped kerbs on the southern kerbline of Green Walk. Targeted enforcement of the parking prohibitions at this location will have to take place.</p>
<p>Emergency services will be affected as there will be no room for them in the first part of Rothsay Street.</p>	<p>Rothsay Street is proposed to be one-way westbound from Tower Bridge Road to Alice Street and therefore access for emergency vehicles into Rothsay Street to access the Jam Factory or the Meakin Estate is not compromised.</p>
<p>Traffic on Tower Bridge Road will become even more impeded and congested.</p>	<p>Signalising the junction will significantly reduce the existing conflict issues experienced at this junction. The signals are to be coordinated with other junctions to provide the most efficient operation to benefit all road users.</p>

Site I	Objection	Response
	Too much investment in a cycle route that does not lead anywhere.	Measures along the Quietway route align with the council's emerging cycling strategy and the Mayor's Vision for Cycling. The route provides a direct path across the borough from South Bermondsey Station to commuter destinations in the west, including Waterloo.
	Why the parking on the north side needs to change?	Parking has been removed / relocated to allow for an eastbound contra-flow cycle lane to be installed.
	Making the northern section of Pilgrimage Street no entry from Tabard Street.	There is no proposal to implement a northbound no entry prohibition for vehicles on Pilgrimage Street at its junction with Tabard Street.
	Segregated cycle lanes are not needed on a Quietway Route, the solution is over engineered and will reduce future capacity for cycling the route in the future.	existing road layout of Tabard Street between Pilgrimage Street and Becket Street is considered poor for cyclists. Proving segregation will improve cycling safety and ensure that the cycle lane will be free from obstruction at all times.
	Tabard Street and Law Street still remain rat runs for non-local traffic. Both roads should be 'access only' and blocked off to through traffic.	Law Street and Tabard Street carry low volumes of traffic compared to neighbouring roads and is therefore are the most appropriate route for the Quietway. Due to the controversial nature of preventing through traffic and the potential access changes to residential and commercial properties, a separate consultation specifically on this proposal would be required.
	The introduction of additional parking bays on the south side of Tabard Street will force cyclists to ride in the 'door zone'.	As traffic volumes on Tabard Street are low, the risk to cyclists traversing the eastern carriageway with parking bays enter side is minimal. Cyclists will be able to take the centre line of the carriageway away from the 'door zone'.

Site J	Objection	Response
	The proposals are a waste of money, will not improve the area and will only benefit a few.	The council welcomes significant investment from Transport for London to take forward the Quietway programme. The proposals in Globe Street will provide a significant improvement to the streetscape, with specific benefits to cyclists and pedestrians
	The proposed development is unnecessary and overcomplicated.	Globe Street is poor compared with the streetscape in adjacent areas. As there is no traffic traversing this section of Globe Street, there is an excellent opportunity as part of the Quietway initiatives to upgrade the streetscape into a high quality public space that can be enjoyed by all road users.
	More cyclists will use the footway to avoid the carriageway barrier endangering pedestrians and children.	Modifications to the existing barrier will potentially alleviate this issue by making it easier for cyclists to traverse through without conflict.
	The proposal to widen the barrier on Trinity Street will result in modes and motorcycles using the barrier as a rat run.	The existing layout of the barrier presents an accessibility issue to the Quietway route. The existing gap is not appropriate to accommodate considerable volumes of cyclists or disabled cyclists. No evidence to suggest the street will become a rat run for motorcyclists.
	The retention of the existing barrier is a major floor in the scheme. It is extremely awkward to negotiate, even on a normal bike let alone a mobility bike.	Widening the barrier width adjacent to the gate will assist the passage of cyclists, making it easier to manoeuvre through this infrastructure without conflict
	The proposals actually make condition worse for cyclists by introducing more give way points on Globe Street.	Changing the priorities at the junction of Trinity Street and Globe Street will have little benefit due to low traffic volumes and speed. Other priorities will be reviewed in Globe Street as part of detailed design process.

Site K	Objection	Response
	Changes to Great Suffolk Street over the last few years have adversely affected the parade of shops and that this could make things worse.	The proposed measures will not have any adverse impact on local businesses or trade. There is no parking removal proposed adjacent to the shopping parade or traffic prohibition measures that will adversely affect access to Great Suffolk Street.
	Taking away resident parking bays.	There is no net loss of parking associated with the scheme.
	Cyclists have scant regard for pedestrians and complete contempt for pavement users/	cyclists will be confined to the carriageway along Great Suffolk Street so there is minimal chance of conflict with pedestrians.
	Great Suffolk Street is a busy rat run. Either providing full segregation or removal of motor traffic through modal filtering.	Segregation of cycle lanes is not suitable on Quietway routes and not appropriate for Great Suffolk Street. The traffic volumes using Great Suffolk Street is low compared to other roads in the area.
	There are no changes to Great Suffolk Street that will benefit cyclists.	Numerous benefits for cyclists which include. Traffic speed reduction, in-setting the parking bays by building out the footway will remove potential conflict and resurfacing the carriageway will improve the ride quality for cyclists.
	Semi-segregated cycle lanes are useless and motorists will park in them.	Installing armadillo lane delineators will make the cycle lane more prominent and should prevent encroachment of motor vehicles. Installing kerbside waiting prohibitions will also assist with enforcement and vehicle encroachment.
Site L	Objection	Response
	Proposals will not prevent cyclists taking a shortcut over the pavement to access Webber Street.	The proposed measures will significantly reduce the risk of cyclists continuing to traverse across the signalised pedestrian crossing and public square and should give cyclists more confidence when crossing the junction.

<p>Parking loss is unacceptable as is the introduction of double yellow lines.</p>	<p>There is no parking loss associated with these proposals and all existing short stay and permit holder bays in Great Suffolk Street are to be retained. Double yellow lines only proposed directly at junction.</p>
<p>It will be impossible for vehicles to pick up and drop off on the kerb outside no. 118 Southwark Bridge Road.</p>	<p>There is an existing single yellow line retained for the majority of the frontage adjacent to no. 118 Southwark Bridge Road allowing for loading activity to service this building.</p>
<p>There are enough measures already for cyclists and they make crossing the road hazardous.</p>	<p>the majority of collisions involving cycles take place at signaled junctions. Therefore it essential that safety improvements and new technology is introduced to not only reduce the number and severity of accidents, but encourage more people to cycle as a primary mode of transport. There is no evidence to suggest that cyclists pose a safety risk for pedestrians crossing the carriageway.</p>
<p>Work is a waste of time and money and the reality is that London is not designed for cycling.</p>	<p>The measures proposed align with the council's emerging cycling strategy and the Mayor's Vision for Cycling. Cycling numbers increasing and there is a requirement to make road safer for this mode of transport.</p>
<p>Cyclists currently bypass the traffic lights by using the pavement and pedestrian crossing resulting in collisions.</p>	<p>. The proposed cycle access and priority improvements will significantly reduce existing conflict risk at the junction between cyclists and other road users.</p>
<p>Great Suffolk Street and Webber Street are too busy to be a Quietway route. Either provide full segregation or prevent through traffic with modal filtering.</p>	<p>Webber Street and Great Suffolk Street carry low volumes of traffic compared to neighbouring roads and is therefore are the most appropriate route for the Quietway. Due to the controversial nature of preventing through traffic and the potential access changes to residential and commercial properties, a separate consultation specifically on this proposal would be required.</p>

Site M	Objection	Response
	The proposals are making the road narrower. Keep the road width as it is.	The proposed footway buildouts are the same width as existing parking bays and therefore the proposals do not result in narrowing adjacent running lane widths.
	The council is pandering to cyclists. They should not be given special treatment at our cost.	Cycling numbers are increasing year on year and it is essential to ensure that appropriate safety and accessibility measures are implemented on public highway to cater for this growing, sustainable mode of transport.
	Majority of the works are unnecessary and that there are more important things the council should be spending money on.	The project is being externally funded by the Mayor of London and not the council. The council is unable to spend the funding on any other measures
	No problem with the Blackfriars Road junction and do not favour losing residential parking spaces.	The greatest risk to cyclists using this junction is potential conflict from motor vehicles turning left across the path of cyclists traversing straight ahead. There is no net loss of resident parking bays in Webber Street as a result of these proposals.
	Cyclists ignore red lights and crossing the Blackfriars Road junction as a pedestrian is like dicing with death. Semi-segregated cycle lane will cause a lot of problems.	There is no evidence to suggest that cyclists pose a safety risk for pedestrians crossing the carriageway at this location. The cycle lanes are an essential measure that will provide cyclists unobstructed access to the advanced cycle waiting areas past queuing traffic.
	Too much traffic uses Webber Street for a Quietway route and the measures should go further by closing the street to through traffic.	Traffic volumes using Webber Street is low compared to other roads in the area. Due to the controversial nature of preventing through traffic a separate consultation specifically on this proposal would be required.

More detailed information on objections and responses can be viewed in section 2.3 of the attached consultation reports (appendices 1-6).

Full details of the consultation strategy, results, conclusions and recommendations can be found in the appendices to these report.

Recommendations to the cabinet member for regeneration, planning, and transport

9. On the basis of the results of the public consultation the Cabinet Member is recommended to approve the implementation of the Quietway Cycling Sites H to M proposals (subject to formal statutory consultation).

Policy implications

10. The recommendations contained within this report are consistent with the policies of the Transport Plan 2011, particularly:

Policy 1.1 – pursue overall traffic reduction

Policy 2.3 – promote and encourage sustainable travel choices in the borough

Policy 4.2 – create places that people can enjoy

Policy 5.1 - Improve safety on our roads and to help make all modes of transport safer. The proposals are in line with the Mayor of London's Vision for Cycling.

Community impact statement

11. The implementation of any transport project creates a range of community impacts. All transport schemes aim to improve the safety and security of vulnerable groups and support economic development by improving the overall transport system and access to it. Cycling infrastructure proposals also have the added advantage of improving the environment through reduction in carbon emissions and social health and fitness benefits. No group has been identified as being disproportionately adversely affected as a result of these proposals. Cyclists and pedestrians will benefit.

Resource implications

1. This report is for the purposes of consultation only and there are no resource implications associated with it.
2. It is however noted that this project is funded by Transport for London in the 2014/2015 financial year with an allocated budget of £4.6mill. (£2.6m for the central grid section – Sites H to M and £2mill for the external section of the route – Sites A to G).

Consultation

3. Ward members were consulted prior to commencement of the consultation.
4. Informal public consultation was carried out in August / September 2014, as detailed above.
5. This report provides an opportunity for final comment to be made by the Community Council prior to a key decision scheduled to be taken by the Cabinet member for regeneration, planning, and transport in November 2014.
6. If approved for implementation this will be subject to statutory consultation required in the making of any permanent Traffic Management Orders.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Transport Plan 2011	Southwark Council Environment Public Realm Network Development 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH Online: http://www.southwark.gov.uk/info/200107/transport_policy/1947/southwark_transport_plan_2011	Matthew Hill Tel: 020 7525 3541

APPENDICES (circulated to members in Supplemental Agenda No.1)

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Quietway Cycling Proposals Site H – Consultation Report
Appendix 2	Quietway Cycling Proposals Site I – Consultation Report
Appendix 3	Quietway Cycling Proposals Site J – Consultation Report
Appendix 4	Quietway Cycling Proposals Site K – Consultation Report
Appendix 5	Quietway Cycling Proposals Site L – Consultation Report
Appendix 6	Quietway Cycling Proposals Site M – Consultation Report

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Des Waters, Head of Public Realm	
Report Author	Chris Mascord, Principal Consultant	
Version	Final	
Dated	15 September 2014	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Director of Legal Services	No	No
Strategic Director of Finance and Corporate Services	No	No
Cabinet Member	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	17 September 2014	