

General Support	Which elements of the proposals, in particular, are you in favour of?	Which elements of the proposals, in particular, are you not in favour of?
Partly support	Better street appearance.	<p>Object to paving over the splitter island at junction with Walworth Road No access for cycles to ASL heading east. Westbound contraflow lane at Walworth Road needs widening. Road narrowing adds extra risk for 'contraflow' cyclists. Footway widening at corner creates danger for cyclists in dark if no vehicles parked in bays. Kerb lines should be as consistent as possible and not suddenly change Motors following cycle would not expect a sudden change in direction by cyclists. If needed should be tapered. Hampton Street should have contraflow cycling for local residents to access Walworth. Road without having to go through traffic signals. Why not make Steedman 2 way and you can drop signage and road marking. Why 4 cycle stands in 1 place? Spread them out.</p>
Partly support	Parking reduction. Contraflow cycling. Some pavement widening.	<p>Lack of light segregated on contraflow cycle lines (where possible) - for example wands/bolt down kerbs/"armadillos"</p> <p>Road narrows to 3.9 metres on corner of stedman Street. Dangerous for cyclists vs oncoming cars. Make wider or remove parking here</p> <p>Make hampton street contraflow Road cycles. The road is wide enough.</p> <p>Wollaston Road junction too splayed, narrow road down. Encourages speeding and increases pedestrian crossing length.</p>
Partly support	<p>Priority given to pedestrians at junction's.</p> <p>Raised tables to keep speeds low.</p> <p>Larger pavement's for nicer walking experiences.</p>	<p>Removal of planters on cycle contract-flow. These were a nice aspects that has been lost in these designs.</p> <p>Removal of cycle feeder lane - cyclists might be encouraged to go on the pavement to access the advanced stop line creating conflict with pedestrians. Better to prevent access by motor vehicles and instead make it accessibly by cycles only.</p>

Partly support	Wider pavements, reduction in parking, double yellow, and trees, this is all going to make walking and cycling much more attractive. At the moment it is very much a street for cars to park disgracefully.	I would have like to see the north pavement of hampton street near the junction with steedman street included in the scheme (wider pavement, no parking). This would help with the turn given that cars coming down hampton street can go pretty fast and not leave space for a bike coming up to wait before taking a right turn into hampton street.
Fully support	Wider footways, speed reduction, improvement to the quality and consistency of the public realm. Overall this is a great scheme that will make a real difference to people's lives in West Walworth and especially the estates to the west of the Walworth Road	<p>I would (in a personal capacity) just like to raise the following issues.</p> <p>1) I perfectly understand that compromises have been necessary along Hampton St in order to retain/accommodate existing uses but remain concerned about a carriageway width of 6.2metres at the western edge of the railway bridge. This then widens further to the east of Spare St and continues to give the impression of a space for vehicles rather than people in foot.</p> <p>2) The area to the east of Spare St is amongst the lowest quality pedestrian environments in the area at present and I wonder if anything can be done to reduce the carriageway capacity between Spare St and the Walworth Road through pavement extensions etc.</p> <p>3) In the light of 2 above and potentially nothing being possible in this respect, more may be needed to address vehicle speeds. I realise that vehicle speeds are generally low but the introduction of traffic calming in the form of a 100mm high full-width sinusoidal humps should be considered a) on Hampton St between Spare St and the Walworth Road - driving is often aggressive as drivers turning off the Walworth Road meet people on foot who are emerging north bound from Spare St and b) on Steedman St at the point on the consultation map where the road width is shown as 3.9 metres. As people are emerging on foot from the Newington Estate, vehicles are often driven at speed around the corner from the north and slowing them with a hump would reduce the intimidation that pedestrians experience. In addition, people cycling will be heading northbound in a contraflow and a hump just before this corner as vehicles are heading southbound will help reduce the intimidation that they will experience if there is aggressive driving.</p>
Partly support	the improvements to public realm; foliage, lighting paving are broadly welcomed and the opening up of Steedman Street to improve access to pedestrian traffic is great.	The lack of any improvement to the public ream from the railway to Walworth road on Hampton Street comes as a big surprise. Whilst the narrowing of the street compromised busies activity the improvements to the pavements would have made Hampton Street more inviting and pleasant. I fail to understand why

		<p>Steedman had been prioritised as both stress were originally included therefore the budget was originally available. Hampton provides pedestrian access to Draper Hall, Eagles Yard, he church, the play school as well as parts of the newington and Strata and Draper as well as Spare Street. There is a considerable problem with fly tipping beside the dragon castle and their unsightly bins which are not addressed at all. There could be hidden by planters of a low wall. Explanation please.</p>
Partly disagree		<p>Removing cycle lane, meaning it will be impossible for cyclists to get past queuing motor vehicles to reach the ASL.</p> <p>Reasons given do not make sense - ASLs are there to prioritise cycles over traffic going in the same direction NOT from the other direction, so as to reduce the risk of left-hooks. (See Highway Code etc. for details).</p> <p>But also this is a big wide junction and, if they can't access the ASL, slower cyclists turning right will not have time to safely clear the junction before the signal phase changes.</p>