

APPENDIX B

Rotherhithe Cycleway consultation

Summary Report

November 2019

How we consulted

What was consulted?

This report summarises the consultation feedback for the Rotherhithe Cycleway which links Cycleway 4 and Quietway 14 as a first phase and we are exploring potential connections towards Peckham. The proposals are located in Rotherhithe and Surrey Docks Wards.

Future cycling demand is predicting there will be a significant desire to/from Peckham and beyond, with up to 150 cyclists using this section of the route during the peak period, in the event of a free ferry crossing being developed.

The proposals include:

- a. Existing roundabouts at Redriff Road junctions with Surrey Quays Road and Quebec Way replaced with traffic signals with pedestrian crossings on each arm of the junction
- b. Two-way segregated cycleway on Redriff Road \ Salter Road between Lower Road and Rotherhithe Street
- c. Four new zebra crossings with three with cycle crossings
- d. 15 trees removed with nine new trees proposed. The Lower Road project will have an overall gain of 11 trees so across both project there is a potential overall gain of five trees.
- e. Change of traffic priorities at Rotherhithe Street junction
- f. Road humps on Rotherhithe Street

Consultation Process

Public consultation of the Rotherhithe Cycleway were part of the Rotherhithe Movement Plan (RMP) consultation. The RMP also included the following projects:

- a. Lower Road two way streets Cycleway 4
- b. Surrey Docks and Rotherhithe Controlled Parking Zone

Public consultation took place from 15 July to 4 October 2019. All residents and businesses within the two wards invited to comment on the proposals.

During the week before 15 July post cards was dropped through the mailbox of all addresses in the two wards and 100m into the Borough of Lewisham. A second post card was also delivered prior to the final drop in session.

The distribution area was large enough to gain views from the wider community that may be considered to be affected by the proposed measures. A copy of the postcards is appended.

Consultees were invited to attend drop in sessions as listed below and advised to respond to the consultation via the online consultation portal. They were also given an email address and telephone number by which to respond:

- a. 23 Jul 2019 at 17:30 to 20:00 at Canada Water Library
- b. 8 Aug 2019 at 18:00 to 20:00 at Osprey Estate TRA Hall
- c. 30 Aug 2019 at 12:00 to 18:00 at Canada Water Library
- d. 7 Sep 2019 at 12:00 to 18:00 at Bacon's College

The consultation was also available online via the consultation portal. The portal included the following downloads/links:

<https://www.southwark.gov.uk/parking/parking-projects/rotherhithe-movement-plan>

Public access to the online form was removed at the end of the consultation period.

In addition letters were sent out to all businesses inviting them to a meeting on the 25 July at the Osprey Estate.

All shops on the effected parts of Lower Road, Plough Way, Rotherhithe New Road, Rotherhithe Old Road and Bush Road were visited on the 5 and 8 August. The shop owners and managers were given some consultation material and given a quick explanation of how the proposals might effect them, and were asked for any views they may have and encouraged to visit the consultation hub for more details and to complete the formal consultation..

A copy of the letter and the questionnaire is appended.

Officers also attended both the Rotherhithe and Surrey Docks ward forums on the 24 July and 21 August respectively, where the RMP was explained to those in attendance and were encouraged to visit the consultation hub.

In addition a number of meetings were held with various resident and tenants groups.

The consultation closed on 4 October 2019. Public access to the online portal was removed at midnight on this date.

A total of 357 online responses were received during the consultation period, together with 822 individual comments making a total of 1306 comments.

Consultation Results

Consultation Returns and Response Rate

The consultation was formed of three parts:

- Your experience, which contains general information about the respondent and the results are contained below in answer to questions 1 to 3
- Proposals, respondents were asked to give their degree of support or opposition in questions 4 to 12 to various sections of the Cycleway and question 15 asked for their overall support or opposition. The results are contained below
- Views, people were also give the opportunity to comment on each section and the overall proposals, these comments are contained in Appendix 2 of this report

Your experience of using the street

Question 1: Are you

Are you	Number	%
A resident	223	62.5%
A visitor	31	8.7%
A passer-by	19	5.3%
A commuter	69	19.3%
A business/organisation	6	1.7%
Please specify	9	2.5%
Total	357	

Question 2: How do you usually travel in the area?

Response	Number	%
On foot	218	61.1%
On foot with pushchair/buggy	37	10.4%
Wheelchair	3	0.8%
Bicycle/other cycle	266	74.5%
Motorcycle	6	1.7%
Bus	149	41.7%
Car or other motor vehicle	95	26.6%
Other	7	1.9%
Not Answered	11	3%
Grand Total	792	

Question 3: With regards to travel on Lower Road and the surrounding area, what is most important to you

Response	Number	%
Green spaces	50	14%
Car parking spaces	9	2.5%
Seating	0	
Shelter	0	
Crossing points	11	3.1%
Safety	166	46.5%
Cycle parking	5	1.4%
Air Quality	73	20.4%
Other	24	6.7%
Not Answered	19	5.3%
Total	357	
Comments	58	16%

Analysis by section

The consultation for the Rotherhithe Cycleway was split into eight sections together with an overall section.

The sections are:

- Section 14. Redriff Road \ Deal Porters Way
- Section 15. Redriff Road (between Surrey Quays Road to Brunswick Quay)
- Section 16. Redriff Road (Quebec Way)
- Section 17. Redriff Road (between Omega Gate to Ropemaker Road)
- Section 18. Redriff Road (between Norway Gate and Quietway 14 connection)
- Section 19. Salter Road \ Rotherhithe Street
- Section 20. Rotherhithe Street (Bryan Road to Durand's Wharf)
- Section 21. Rotherhithe Street (Durand's Wharf to Silver Walk)
- Section 22. Rotherhithe Street (Silver Walk to Acorn Walk)



Respondents were asked for their degree of support or not and were then given a free text boxes to give their views.

The analysis includes the results of the consultation together with the analysis of the free text box.


The main results are shown by each section indicating support or not for the proposals. This is then followed by the free text replies. This has been analysed and presented in the following way, comments and suggestions were grouped together against the consultation headings in the Southwark Movement Plan, there are 83 headings in the plan and comments were then further divided around common themes raised..

To ensure no context was lost from the respondents their entire comment are shown in the tables, however where appropriate only the header theme is answered. For example if a respondent raised two concerns, one on the loss of trees and the other on speed of traffic there complete response is placed in two groups, but only the relevant issues is responded to in that group. The relevant comment has been made bold where multiple comments have been made.

Section 14





Section 15. Redriff Road (between Surrey Quays Road to Brunswick Quay)



Question 5	Number	%
Do you support the proposals for Redriff Road \ Deal Porters Way?		
Strongly support	197	55.2%
Support	40	11.2%
Neither support nor oppose	12	3.4%
Oppose	12	3.4%
Strongly oppose	36	10.1%
Not answered	60	16.8%
Total	357	
Individuals making comments (estimated number of comments)	77 (118)	21.6%

Section 15





Section 16. Redriff Road (Quebec Way)




Question 6. Do you support the proposals for Redriff Road (Quebec Way)?	Number	%
Strongly support	197	55.2%
Support	37	10.4%
Neither support nor oppose	10	2.8
Oppose	16	4.5%
Strongly oppose	34	9.5%
Not answered	63	17.6
Total	357	
Individuals making comments (estimated number of comments)	74 (119)	20.7%

Section 16



Section 17. Redriff Road (between Omega Gate to Ropemaker Road)





Question 7.


Do you support the proposals for Redriff Road (between Omega Gate to Ropemaker Road)?

	Number	%
Strongly support	183	51.3%
Support	50	14%
Neither support nor oppose	8	2.2%
Oppose	12	3.4%
Strongly oppose	41	11.5%
Not answered	63	17.6%
Total	357	
Individuals making comments (estimated number of comments)	103 (176)	28.8%

Section 17



Section 18. Redriff Road (between Norway Gate and Quietway 14 connection)





Question 8.


Do you support the proposals for Redriff Road (between Norway Gate to Quietway 14 connection)?

	Number	%
Strongly support	192	53.8%
Support	44	12.3%
Neither support nor oppose	9	2.5%
Oppose	15	4.2%
Strongly oppose	35	9.8%
Not answered	62	17.4%
Total	357	
Individuals making comments (estimated number of comments)	89 (143)	24.9%

Section 18



Section 19. Salter Road \ Rotherhithe Street



Question 9.

Do you support the proposals for Salter Road \ Rotherhithe Street?

Number

Strongly support

188

52.7%

Support

51

14.3%

Neither support nor oppose

13

3.6%

Oppose

11

3.1%

Strongly oppose

38

10.6%

Not answered

56

15.7%

Grand Total


357

Individuals making comments (estimated number of comments)

90 (158)



25.2%

Section 20. Rotherhithe Street (Bryan Road to Durand's Wharf)




Question 10.		
Do you support the proposals for Rotherhithe Street (Bryan Road to Durand's Wharf)?	Number	%
Strongly support	157	44%
Support	52	14.6%
Neither support nor oppose	34	9.5%
Oppose	16	4.5%
Strongly oppose	27	7.6%
Not answered	71	19.9%
Grand Total	357	
Individuals making comments (estimated number of comments)	58 (87)	16.2%

Section 20





Section 21. Rotherhithe Street (Durand's Wharf to Silver Walk)



Question 11. Do you support the proposals for Rotherhithe Street (Durand's Wharf to Silver Walk)?	Number	%
Strongly support	152	42.6%
Support	50	14.%
Neither support nor oppose	37	10.4%
Oppose	17	4.8%
Strongly oppose	21	5.9%
Not answered	80	22.4%
Grand Total	357	
Individuals making comments (estimated number of comments)	55 (88)	15.4%

Section 21





Section 22. Rotherhithe Street (Silver Walk to Acorn Walk)




Question 12. Do you support the proposals for Rotherhithe Street Silver Walk to Acorn Walk	Number	%
Strongly support	156	43.7%
Support	58	16.2%
Neither support nor oppose	35	9.8%
Oppose	15	4.2%
Strongly oppose	21	5.9%
Not answered	72	20.2%
Grand Total	357	
Individuals making comments (estimated number of comments)	59 (85)	16.5%

Section 22





Analysis of proposal


Question 13. Do you support the overall proposals?	Number	%
Strongly support	234	65.5%
Support	44	12.3%
Neither support nor oppose	8	2.2%
Oppose	13	3.6%
Strongly oppose	42	11.8%
Not answered	16	4.5%
Grand Total	357	
Individuals making comments (estimated number of comments)	146 (232)	40.9%



Rotherhithe Cycleway



E-mail comments



Free text response, answers can be found in Appendix 2

Responses received from stakeholders

<p>Tideway</p>  <p>Tideway - LB Southwark Rotherhit</p>	<p>London Cycling Campaign</p>  <p>Re Rotherhithe Cycleway.msg</p>	<p>Southwark Cyclists</p>  <p>Rotherhithe Movement Plan - Rotl</p>
<p>Britishland</p>  <p>20191004 RMP - BL Response.pdf</p>	<p>Rotherhithe Housing Forum</p>  <p>Rotherhithe Movement Plan Consult</p>	<p>SKC</p>  <p>SKC Consultation Response - RMP Rott</p>

Main issues raised

As would be expected general comments have been made either supporting or not supporting the proposals, a number of minor matters have been raised and these are dealt with in the body of this report and will be addressed at the next design stage and do not materially effect the proposals.

The more significant points detailed below, again can be addressed as the project moves to the detailed design stage and again do not materially effect the proposals

The main themes are listed below and specific details are included in each section below.

- Loss of trees and verges
- Concern over the number of traffic signal junctions being proposed
- Removal of bus lay-bys
- Facility not extending around the remainder of Salter Road\Brunel Road
- Support for the provision of the segregated cycling facilities

Concerns raised by section

Section 14 -No specific points were raised that requires significant changes to the design of this section

Section 15 – The safety at the junction of Brunswick Quays, this relates to visibility turning out of Brunswick Quay and for drivers turning left into the Brunswick Quays being in conflict with cyclist on the segregated cycle facility. This will be assessed further at the detailed design stage.

Section 16 - The loss of the southbound bus stop is a concern.

Section 17 - The proposed zebra crossing is not on the main desire line. The proposed location of the zebra crossing is situated between two relocated bus stops. Observations appear to suggest that most people crossing in the vicinity of Omega Gate do so to alight or board a bus. Residents believe that the main desire is to the Russia Dock Woodlands.

There were also requests to make this a tiger crossing; this is link into point 5.

The crossing of Redriff Road at this location is being reviewed and the appropriate position of the crossing will be confirmed at the detailed design stage.

There was also a suggestion in the consultation to link the Cycleway into NCR 425 which runs close by through the Russia Dock Woodlands. Unfortunately this is not considered feasible as there is sufficient space to link this and there are considered more logical routes to be taken between the two routes

The safety at the junction of Omega Gate, this relates drivers turning left into the Omega Gate being in conflict with cyclist on the segregated cycle facility. This will be assessed further at the detailed design stage.

Section 18 - The safety at the junction of Norway Gate, this relates to drivers turning left into the Norway Gate being in conflict with cyclist on the segregated cycle facility. This will be assessed further at the detailed design stage.

Respondents want the speed camera to remain. The new alignment of the road is likely to result in the camera not being effective here. We will discuss with the police its location here or in alternative locations.

Section 19 - The proposed layout of the Salter Road \ Rotherhithe Street is complicated and confusing. The main concerns relate around the following:

1. Speed of traffic as a result of geometry of the design
2. Pedestrian and cycle crossing in the right location in terms of what is closest to Salter Road
3. Pedestrian crossing to and from the eastern side of Rotherhithe Street
4. What will be the biggest flow for cyclists, along Salter Road or Rotherhithe Street

This will be assessed further at the detailed design stage.

Section 20 - The bend and the associated parking close to Surrey Docks Farm, particularly the speed of traffic and a cyclists going past parked vehicles. This will be assessed further at the detailed design stage

The type of traffic calming used on Rotherhithe Street and its not required

The need for filtered permeability or further cycle facilities are needed on Rotherhithe Street

Section 21 - The type of traffic calming used on Rotherhithe Street and its not required. The need for filtered permeability or further cycle facilities are needed on Rotherhithe Street

Section 22 - The type of traffic calming used on Rotherhithe Street and its not required

The need for filtered permeability or further cycle facilities are needed on Rotherhithe Street

Appendix 1 – Consultation Flyer and business questionnaire

Rotherhithe movement plan

#rotherhitthemovementplan

Help us to change your streets

Have your say on proposals to improve walking, cycling, parking and public transport in the Rotherhithe area.

Please turn over to see why the proposals have been developed.

For more details on the proposed plans and to respond to the questionnaire please visit:

www.southwark.gov.uk/rotherhitthemovementplan

Please respond by 4 October 2014

@lb_southwark facebook.com/southwarkcouncil



Proposals

A + C Lower Road creating two way streets

We want to change how the streets perform so that we can improve:

- Walking - by providing new crossings and widening footways
- Cycling - by providing segregated cycleway
- Bus reliability - improving bus journey times
- Local access issues - by creating two-way streets
- Public realm - such as Lower Road shopping area

B Rotherhithe and Surrey Docks CPZ

The changes in the Rotherhithe area in the coming years mean that a controlled parking zone (CPZ) for the area is essential. In particular, this is the only way to enforce the permit-free planning conditions for the Canada Water development and prevent an inevitable increase in parking pressure on your streets.

D Rotherhithe Cycleway

Cycling demand has been identified between Rotherhithe and Peckham we have therefore developed proposals for the section between Hawkstone Road and Rotherhithe Street along Redriff Road and Salter Road. The route identified links proposed and existing cycle routes in the area and will further encourage and assist active travel.

Have your say at www.southwark.gov.uk/rotherhitthemovementplan

If you would like to discuss and view the changes come along to our drop in sessions:

23 July, 5.30pm to 8pm
Canada Water library

8 August, 6pm to 8pm
Osprey Estate TRA hall

30 August, 12pm to 6pm
Canada Water library

7 September, 12pm to 6pm
Bacon's College

Contact details: highways@southwark.gov.uk, or 020 7525 2665/020 7525 0822.

FREEPOST RSCT-BHXX-SCAJ, Highways Division (Transport Projects) Floor 3, Hub 2, Southwark Council, PO BOX 64529, London, SE1P 5LX



@lb_southwark facebook.com/southwarkcouncil



1. Business name and Address (make note before going into business)

2. Explain we are from Southwark and ask if we can talk to the owner or the manager.
3. If not there ask when is it best to speak to them, if possible take contact details or give our contact details.

4. If they are there explain that we would like to discuss, proposed changes to the streets in the area is it convenient to discuss now, if not when.

5. Find out if manager or owner and or role in business



6. Find out if they received a leaflet

Yes	No	Not sure
-----	----	----------

Handout the following:

- Flyer
- Overview plan
- Proposals outside their premises

Explain the objectives\projects\changes.

The proposal will involve major changes to the streets in the area. The changes are intended to make the area more attractive, safe and accessible, particularly for residents, pedestrians, cyclists and bus passengers.

The main changes are:

- All main roads become two-way
- Outside Surrey Quays Station, bus and cycle only
- New pedestrian crossing by Cope Street
- Reduced traffic speeds
- More buses going northbound (1, 47, 188, 255, 381 & P12)
- New double yellow lines on south-west side of Lower Road
- New loading bays
- Parking provided on Cope Street

We believe the improvements should bring more visitors to the area and help make it an attractive environment to spend time in. However, we are aware that loss of parking spaces in the area may cause some concern for businesses. There will also be some disruption during the construction period

We want to find out from local businesses what kinds of improvements would be most appreciated, so that we can support you to attract customers and build your businesses.

Possibilities for improvements could include:

- Pavement surface improvements
- Tree planting
- Raised plant beds
- Public seating

Ask them to visit web-site to see scheme in more detail and complete questions on the hub Record their comments positive and negative

Improve air quality	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Narrow roads already. Taking space for cycle lane will only increase congestion on road and increase pollution on Redriff Road which has schools.</p> <p>No plans for Rotherhithe Canary Wharf Bridge means cycle lanes are useless till such time a proper crossing is created. Trying to create something that may not happen for next 5 years on crossing is a waste of public money</p>	<p>The provision of safer cycle facilities will give people the opportunity to cycle rather than drive, which will assist in the improvement of air quality</p>
<p>Taking away road space will not improve traffic. It will mean more traffic on less roads resulting in congestion/pollution.</p> <p>Too much road space is being taken for a small minority of people that cycle.</p>	

Crossing roads is easy and safe	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I am very concerned about the cycle ways and my ability to cross the road from the bus stop to the pavement. My experience of cyclists is that they are very aggressive and will not stop at lights.</p>	<p>TfL have carried out research into this issue and have concluded that this type of layout should have a zebra crossing to aid pedestrians and clarify priorities. A zebra crossing across the cycleway is proposed at all locations where there is a bus stop.</p>
<p>1. Traffic signals will significantly slow down local buses in the area, which are already very slow and it takes a long while to get to the nearest tube/overground stations. This adds a lot to overall commute time.</p> <p>2. Rotherhithe Street is very narrow and it's really struggling with 2 way traffic at peak times. A cycle track will only make the situation worse.</p> <p>3. The increased number of cyclists in the area will make it less safe for walking, especially for children and parents with a buggy, it will also increase the amount of garbage on the streets and will likely lead to the increased crime rate too.</p>	<p>There is no reason why a cycleway should make the road less safe for pedestrians. The road width is generally being reduced, which will slow vehicle speeds and thereby lower the risk to pedestrians. In addition the proposal overall provide additional controlled crossings</p>
<p>We need less traffic lights and more zebra crossings.</p>	<p>The existing junction is controlled by traffic signals so the use of zebra crossings at this location is not appropriate</p>

<p>This will make it much harder to cross the road as a pedestrian. Narrower roads make it much more dangerous as a pedestrian. Narrower roads will result in more traffic.</p>	<p>A narrower road should make it safer for pedestrians as traffic speeds are reduced and the distance to cross is less.</p>
---	--

Do not agree with traffic calming/reduction and cycle lanes

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Against cycle proposals</p>	
<p>No need for a separated two way cycle track (and I am a cyclist and use the road every day). The road is already safe with very limited traffic and speed is limited at 20mph. You would better ensure the speed limit is respected.</p>	<p>The provision of safer cycling facilities is a priority for the Council. This proposal allows us to link existing and proposed cycle routes. These proposals will give people the opportunity to cycle local journeys as well journeys further afield.</p>
<p>Opposed to narrower roads and creating a segregated cycle way. Narrower roads will not help with driver speed, just make it more dangerous.</p>	
<p>It is not required a cycleway</p>	
<p>I do not support the restriction of already small streets into smaller streets. Cyclists are not well served by encouraging them to be on the roads carrying the vehicles most likely to kill them (buses and lorries) . Better to have cycle paths along the river front or through parks and the nature reserve that to put them on a red route</p>	
<p>1. Traffic signals will significantly slow down local buses in the area, which are already very slow and it takes a long while to get to the nearest tube/overground stations. This adds a lot to overall commute time. 2. Rotherhithe Street is very narrow and it's really struggling with 2 way traffic at peak times. A cycle track will only make the situation worse. 3. The increased number of cyclists in the area will make it less safe for walking, especially for children and parents with a buggy, it will also increase the amount of garbage on the streets and will likely lead to the increased crime rate too.</p>	

Oh dear. More narrowing of roads, more unnecessary traffic lights (that probably will remain stuck on red for 90% of the time. More congestion, more stress, more misery for everybody, and worst of all, HIDEOUS AND UNBREATHABLE AIR.	
Buses have no issue pulling away. The roads are rarely busy, a cycle way abs the disruption building it will cause seems unnecessary.	
The road layout seems to work well at the moment. I cannot see any real benefit to the changes. Redriff/Salter Road has good visibility with grass verges along most of its length making it already safe for pedestrians and cyclists. Also the road currently does not seem to have much traffic.	
I oppose road width reduction and signaled junction with dedicated stage for cyclists and pedestrians.	
Any new cycle way is a no no no	

Easy and safe to cycle	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Deal Porters Way junction	
Need to make sure it's easy for cyclists to turn into/out of Tescos car park and onto the cycle way, but also that the main cycleway gets a good long green light segment, especially given the low traffic volumes using Worgan Street	Cyclists are given there own stage within the traffic signals to turn into both Deal Porters Way and Worgan Street. Green time is allocated as per demand on the various arms of the junction
Cycling eastbound across this junction at present is quite scary as it is two lanes without even any cycle lane at all and quite intimidating and often impossible to get to the front (the safest thing to do). These plans are much better. I hope that due attention is given to the timing of the lights for car traffic with particular reference to the operating hours of Tesco and how this changes on weekdays vs weekends because there is often significant congestion getting in or out of the surrey quays car park. I've written to the council about this before but never received a response. The two bus stops look very close to each other and if	

<p>there are buses at the same time I imagine that traffic would completely cease?</p>	
<p>General support for the cycle facilities</p>	
<p>Great improvement for cyclists, this is a notoriously very car dominated stretch of road. Please ensure appropriate signage for pedestrians using buses informing them that cyclists are near, and signage for cyclists to be cautious when approaching bus stop, even consider using rumble strips to control cyclist speed. More trees and greenery also a plus. Behind the current bus shelter is an old mural structure currently used by the homeless. Ideally we should allow the homeless to continue to use the shelter but if we can make the surrounding area more pleasant that would be great.</p>	<p>Close to the bus stop is a zebra crossing on a road table to help reinforce the presence of pedestrians crossing the cycleway</p>
<p>Looks great. I particularly like that the cycle lanes are separated from traffic. I also like that the narrower roads will encourage people out of their cars and onto public transport. My only concern is with the proximity between the cycle lanes and the pedestrian walkways. I'm hoping that there is some kind of separation (even small) so that pedestrians don't stray into the paths of bikes.</p>	<p>The cycleway and footway are at different levels, except at the zebra crossing</p>
<p>You are making it more cycle and pedestrian friendly, but it looks like lots of messy paving and road and road markings. Really I need the whole detail plan and to go on site, very difficult to do remotely, but it doesn't look like a great cycling scheme as you'd find in the Netherlands. That's a busy bus stop shown, so you have pedestrians crossing the bike route. Not sure that cyclists wouldn't be better on the far side and pedestrians on road side?? Are the trees just not shown? In Netherlands they have whole hedging separating the cars and the bikes...</p>	<p>General support for the proposals</p>
<p>Why are there not separated cycle lanes on both Redriff and Deal Porters?</p>	
<p>This really improves cycling and walking. I've tended to avoid the area.</p>	
<p>I would feel confident using the cycleway. I would try cycling again if this was built</p>	
<p>The provision of segregated cycle ways is welcomed and traffic lights to try and reduce speeds. But Redriff Road and Salter Road are supposed to be 20mph speed limit. How do these proposals seek to enforce this speed limit.</p>	

Would speed cameras that work and fines for all the cars that regularly abuse the speed limit not be an additional measure.	
Fantastic introduction of safe cycle way. Really strongly support this! The only addition I would make is a the opportunity for more planting, the residents really adore our corner of London for its greenery and sense of quiet, it would be lovely if this could be enhanced further.	
This stretch is not cyclist-friendly at present and full of speeding and rat-running motor vehicles.	
strongly support the cycle lane. not the lights. cycle lane should be extended all along salter road	
I often cycle or take the bus to and from Surrey Quays shopping centre and think this would make the road much safer for cyclists and prioritise buses.	
more cycleways please	
Yes please, we need segregated cycle lanes everywhere so cycling is safe and more people do it. My friends are afraid to cycle because cars are dangerous and potentially deadly and cyclists should not have to share a road with them	
We need a cycle route	
Strongly support segregated cycleway.	
More people would cycle if cycling was safe	
Segregated cycle lanes are essential when young children wish to cycle to school /the station etc	
I think its extremely important to segregate cycle lanes from the rest of traffic. I have been commuting by bicycle on this road for nearly ten years and I have lost count of the number of reckless impatient drivers (cars, vans, buses and taxis) that have nearly or actually knocked me off of my bicycle.	
These changes segregated two-way cycleway on the eastside of Redriff Road Access to and from Deal Porters Way via signal controlled junction Advance stop lines on the Deal Porters Way and Worgan Street will make it safer for cyclists	

Will be safer having a segregated cycle lane.	
---	--

Enjoyable environment

Comments and or suggestions	Response
Fantastic introduction of safe cycle way. Really strongly support this! The only addition I would make is a the opportunity for more planting, the residents really adore our corner of London for its greenery and sense of quiet, it would be lovely if this could be enhanced further.	No trees are affected within this section, however, with the designs developed to date we have taken great care to minimise the loss of trees. At the next design stage we will continue this and investigate opportunities to plant additional trees
More trees please!	
More trees not less. If 15 are being felled 9 is not a replacement. Should be 45.	
I oppose the changes because it means the loss of a significant green verge and many trees. I know the plan notes that there will be a net gain in trees, but these will be in different locations to those that will be removed. This will change the quality of the street and walking environment. More trees, planting and landscaping should be provided to mitigate the proposed loss, not elsewhere but in the same locations and proximity to the loss.	
Add trees and SUDs with air quality planting please.	

Improved cyclist behaviours

Comments and or suggestions	Response
I am very concerned about the cycle ways and my ability to cross the road from the bus stop to the pavement. My experience of cyclists is that they are very aggressive and will not stop at lights.	Close to the bus stop is a zebra crossing on a road table to help reinforce the presence of pedestrians crossing the cycleway
What have you done to the 188 bus stop? You need to have a full size bus stop. Not the thin one. I don't like the bus stop on a traffic island because some cyclists are too aggressive. Some cyclists do not stop at these zebras and you can't enforce them to stop. The priority for a cycleway now should be Surrey Quays to Peckham and not to the ferry.	

Improved junctions and/or traffic lights designs and phasing

Comments and or suggestions	Response
Concerns for cyclists	
<p>Need to make sure it's easy for cyclists to turn into/out of tescos car park and onto the cycle way, but also that the main cycleway gets a good long green light segment, especially given the low traffic volumes using worgan street</p>	<p>Cyclists are given there own stage within the traffic signals to turn into both Deal Porters Way and Worgan Street. Green time is allocated as per demand on the various arms of the junction.</p> <p>Facilities to improve cycle egress will be explored at the detailed design stage</p>
<p>Cycling eastbound across this junction at present is quite scary as it is two lanes without even any cycle lane at all and quite intimidating and often impossible to get to the front (the safest thing to do). These plans are much better.</p> <p>I hope that due attention is given to the timing of the lights for car traffic with particular reference to the operating hours of tesco and how this changes on weekdays vs weekends because there is often significant congestion getting in or out of the surrey quays car park. I've written to the council about this before but never received a response.</p> <p>The two bus stops look very close to each other and if there are buses at the same time I imagine that traffic would completely cease?</p>	
<p>New northbound bus stop is located where most traffic congestion is for left turn into shopping centre parking. Pls consider moving the bus stop after the junction</p> <p>it isn't clear how safe will be turning into shopping car (and bike) parking for cyclists given the path is on the south side and there are many cars turning right blocking the junction</p>	
<p>I strongly support this proposal, except for one issue.</p> <p>It would be much safer if there was an early release green lights for cycles entering the junction from Deal Porters Way and Worgan Street.</p> <p>This is because inexperienced cyclists are often slow to get moving and need the extra time, especially when in front of waiting motor traffic in the advanced stop box.</p> <p>The rest of the route is very accessible to inexperienced cyclists or children but the provision for entering the route</p>	

<p>from the aforementioned roads does not match the level of accessibility of the rest of the route.</p> <p>I fear that turning from the aforementioned roads onto the proposed route could be a significantly more scary or difficult experience for inexperienced cyclists or young children than the rest of the proposed route.</p>	
<p>Concerns about capacity</p>	
<p>It will cause greater difficulty for local people to use Surrey Quays Shopping Centre - currently it is only possible to catch buses in one direction from a stop near the Shopping Centre - under these proposals with a new bus stop proposed for the northbound carriageway of Redriff Road, it seems that it shall not be possible to catch buses from Deal Porters Way. These proposals also limit the road space down to one lane each way, which given seven bus routes use this stretch of road will cause much more congestion for people who rely on public transport - many more than 150 people use buses this day on this section of road.</p> <p>This will also cause severe congestion, as there are routinely long queues to turn into Deal Porters Way from the northbound carriageway of Redriff Road. If one lane is removed, this will cause severe congestion for people living in Rotherhithe as bus and car users will have to queue amongst shopping traffic to simply get home. The second lane is therefore necessary for people living in the peninsula.</p>	<p>Despite the introduction of a new stage for cyclists, and the removing of non-blocking right turn storage, the cycle time has remained the same owing to the low call rate of the pedestrian crossing stage. Degrees of saturation will rise slightly, but the junction will still be considered to be within capacity</p>
<p>1. Traffic signals will significantly slow down local buses in the area, which are already very slow and it takes a long while to get to the nearest tube/overground stations. This adds a lot to overall commute time.</p> <p>2. Rotherhithe Street is very narrow and it's really struggling with 2 way traffic at peak times. A cycle track will only make the situation worse.</p> <p>3. The increased number of cyclists in the area will make it less safe for walking, especially for children and parents with a buggy, it will also increase the amount of garbage on the streets and will likely lead to the increased crime rate too.</p>	
<p>Oh dear. More narrowing of roads, more unnecessary traffic lights (that probably will remain stuck on red for</p>	

90% of the time. More congestion, more stress, more misery for everybody, and worst of all, HIDEOUS AND UNBREATHABLE AIR.	
The narrowing of an already busy intersection that frequently becomes blocked along with the inclusion of more bus stops has the potential to increase the disruption to traffic.	
Traffic are a bad idea. Traffic lights will back the traffic up, especially during school runs. Roundabouts work for a better flow of traffic, especially as this road is one of the main ways on and off the peninsula.	
Not sure about this Northbound bus stop given you have taken away a lane and it will cause congestion. It's also not in a very useful place given most people will want to get off at the shopping centre and there are many bus stops there with plenty of space for them.	
The traffic jams at this junction are atrocious as it is, this plan will make matters worse unless you create another exit from the peninsula .	
Would prefer to see a non-signalised junction here utilising give way lines and zebra crossings as have a 4 signal phase junction is very inefficient and will cause delays	This location requires traffic signal control and would not be able to function as a simple priority junction with zebra crossings
Disagree with the introduction of traffic signals. Unnecessary and will slow down and interrupt movement.	These are existing traffic signals at this location
I oppose road width reduction and signaled junction with dedicated stage for cyclists and pedestrians.	
strongly support the cycle lane. not the lights. cycle lane should be extended all along salter road	
These changes segregated two-way cycleway on the eastside of Redriff Road Access to and from Deal Porters Way via signal controlled junction Advance stop lines on the Deal Porters Way and Worgan Street will make it safer for cyclists	
Why are there not separated cycle lanes on both Redriff and Deal Porters?	These are private roads, and with the development of the shopping centre the developer will produce suitable layouts to complement these proposals.

Improved public transport	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I am very concerned about the cycle ways and my ability to cross the road from the bus stop to the pavement. My experience of cyclists is that they are very aggressive and will not stop at lights.</p>	<p>Close to the bus stop is a zebra crossing on a road table to help reinforce the presence of pedestrians crossing the cycleway</p>
<p>Great improvement for cyclists, this is a notoriously very car dominated stretch of road. Please ensure appropriate signage for pedestrians using buses informing them that cyclists are near, and signage for cyclists to be cautious when approaching bus stop, even consider using rumble strips to control cyclist speed. More trees and greenery also a plus. Behind the current bus shelter is an old mural structure currently used by the homeless. Ideally we should allow the homeless to continue to use the shelter but if we can make the surrounding area more pleasant that would be great.</p>	
<p>I'm concerned that the new northbound bus stop will bring the area to a halt down Lower Road as Tesco customers already stack up on the weekends. The traffic is much calmer after the lights further up Redriff Road although a bus stop on the bridge might not be feasible.</p>	<p>The location of the northbound bus stop is very much dependent on the phasing of the various works in the area. Subject to the Cabinet Member approval this scheme would be implemented in 2020/21. At that stage if British Land and/or Lower Road projects have not commenced this bus stop will not be required at the stage, as buses will be still using the access point from Lower Road. ,</p>
<p>new northbound bus stop is located where most traffic congestion is for left turn into shopping centre parking. Pls consider moving the bus stop after the junction</p>	
<p>it isn't clear how safe will be turning into shopping car (and bike) parking for cyclists given the path is on the south side and there are many cars turning right blocking the junction</p>	
<p>The narrowing of an already busy intersection that frequently becomes blocked along with the inclusion of more bus stops has the potential to increase the disruption to traffic.</p>	
<p>Not sure about this Northbound bus stop given you have taken away a lane and it will cause congestion. It's also not in a very useful place given most people will want to get off at the shopping centre and there are many bus stops there with plenty of space for them.</p>	

<p>It will cause greater difficulty for local people to use Surrey Quays Shopping Centre - currently it is only possible to catch buses in one direction from a stop near the Shopping Centre - under these proposals with a new bus stop proposed for the northbound carriageway of Redriff Road, it seems that it shall not be possible to catch buses from Deal Porters Way. These proposals also limit the road space down to one lane each way, which given seven bus routes use this stretch of road will cause much more congestion for people who rely on public transport - many more than 150 people use buses this day on this section of road.</p>	
<p>This will also cause severe congestion, as there are routinely long queues to turn into Deal Porters Way from the northbound carriageway of Redriff Road. If one lane is removed, this will cause severe congestion for people living in Rotherhithe as bus and car users will have to queue amongst shopping traffic to simply get home. The second lane is therefore necessary for people living in the peninsula.</p>	
<p>I often cycle or take the bus to and from Surrey Quays shopping centre and think this would make the road much safer for cyclists and prioritise buses.</p>	
<p>It makes the road worse if there is cycling lane. The road is currently wide enough for cyclists and there are barely many cyclists. Having cycle lane doesn't bring any benefit at all, and it will cause issues for drivers and bus passengers</p>	
<p>What have you done to the 188 bus stop? You need to have a full size bus stop. Not the thin one. I don't like the bus stop on a traffic island because some cyclists are too aggressive. Some cyclists do not stop at these zebras and you can't enforce them to stop. The priority for a cycleway now should be Surrey Quays to Peckham and not to the ferry.</p>	<p>The 188 bus stop is shown stopping in Redriff Road. Three bus routes will use this location and the size should be sufficient. However this comment above. Close to the bus stop is a zebra crossing on a road table to help reinforce the presence of pedestrians crossing the cycleway The continuation of this route is being developed towards Peckham.</p>
<p>I particularly like the new north bound bus stop.</p>	

More and safer cycle infrastructure/ routes	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
strongly support the cycle lane. not the lights. cycle lane should be extended all along salter road	The continuation of this route around Salter Road is being considered
more cycleways please	
Yes please, we need segregated cycle lanes everywhere so cycling is safe and more people do it. My friends are afraid to cycle because cars are dangerous and potentially deadly and cyclists should not have to share a road with them	
We need a cycle route	
What have you done to the 188 bus stop? You need to have a full size bus stop. Not the thin one. I don't like the bus stop on a traffic island because some cyclists are too aggressive. Some cyclists do not stop at these zebras and you can't enforce them to stop. The priority for a cycleway now should be Surrey Quays to Peckham and not to the ferry.	The route has been split into three sections, as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. north of Lower Road 2. between Lower Road and Old Kent Road 3. south of Old Kent Road This sections alignment was relatively straight forward and has therefore been developed earlier. We are currently assessing the quality of potential alignments south of Lower Road, once an alignment is chosen a design will be developed for consultation

No controlled parking	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Again its residents who need their cars, such as those of us with families and tradespeople that the council and government look to hinder. How will the houses receive deliveries if you put in double yellow lines.	Deliveries can be load and unload on yellow lines for up to 40 mins as long as it is safe to do so. We also offer visitors permits and pay by phone bays. Residents still have visits from tradespersons in our other zones and we rarely receive complaints about it.

Other	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Concerns over significant traffic build up in the area as new developments go up	The masterplan has been approved individual developments will be brought back to planning committee

No necessary	
There should be no reduction in motor vehicle carriageway width as a result of introducing a cycle track.	
This is not needed	
Concern about congestion	
It appears that it will make traffic congestion, which is currently getting worse, even worse still.	Generally the traffic signals will operate satisfactorily at peak periods there can be localised congestion, away from the junction capacity should not be an issue
I believe it will cause more congestion , therefore more traffic standing idle, and the character of the area will totally change	
It makes the road worse if there is cycling lane. The road is currently wide enough for cyclists and there are barely many cyclists. Having cycle lane doesn't bring any benefit at all, and it will cause issues for drivers and bus passengers	
Will impede flows of traffic and bring traffic congestion to an area that flows relatively freely at the moment.	
Taking away road space will not improve traffic. It will mean more traffic on less roads resulting in congestion/pollution.	
Too much road space is being taken for a small minority of people that cycle.	
The bridge doesn't have enough width to be able to have the cycle lane as the vehicle lane are already narrow for the buses and hgv's. The cycle lane could go onto Deal Porters Way and then turn right to use the under path to Greenland Dock and go along Brunswick Quay to the top of the dock and then join Rotherhithe Street.	Sufficient space exists to install the cycleway
Let's have as few curbs as possible. Use tactile paving instead of curbs to demarcate the border between the road and the pavement. If you are going to put in curbs, then those curbs should be bevelled. Non-bevelled curbs are a extreme danger to cyclists. TfL has started bevelling the curbs on its cycle lanes. Please do the same. Thank you.	Bevelled kerbs will be used on this project

River crossings	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Narrow roads already. Taking space for cycle lane will only increase congestion on road and increase pollution on redriff Road which has schools.</p> <p>No plans for Rotherhithe Canary Wharf Bridge means cycle lanes are useless till such time a proper crossing is created. Trying to create something that may not happen for next 5 years on crossing is a waste of public money</p>	<p>This proposal aims to link to existing and proposed routes in the area and provide a link to Cycleway 4. It will also provide a key local route to local facilities and destinations further afield. A ferry option is still being investigated should this be taken forward this proposal will complement the crossing</p>
<p>Why are you building a cycle route that goes nowhere as you aren't building the bridge.. WHITE ELEPHANT.</p>	
<p>The cycle route, which presumably was envisaged as a useful link to the new Rotherhithe Bridge, will be a cause for considerable traffic congestion along redriff road, and will not be helped by a change to traffic lights to have a separate cycle sequence.</p> <p>The Bridge project has been cancelled so I believe that there is now no need for a cycle route as planned, as there will be no benefits to road users.</p> <p>The current cycle traffic will not change as there is nowhere for the cyclists to travel to (no crossing bridge).</p>	

Safer speeds	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>The provision of segregated cycle ways is welcomed and traffic lights to try and reduce speeds. But Redriff Road and salter Road are supposed to be 20mph speed limit. How do these proposals seek to enforce this speed limit. Would speed cameras that work and fines for all the cars that regularly abuse the speed limit not be an additional measure.</p>	<p>Southwark to not have the powers to enforce speed limits; however our designs can influence drivers speeds. In this instance the narrowing of the carriageway width has been proved to reduce traffic speeds.</p> <p>We will be discussing with the police the future of the existing speed camera with a view to finding a suitable location.</p>
<p>I don't find these roads intimidating to cyclists they are relatively quiet. I do support traffic calming measures as the speed limit is regularly broken.</p>	


Segregated space for walking, cycling & driving

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I think its extremely important to segregate cycle lanes from the rest of traffic. I have been commuting by bicycle on this road for nearly ten years and I have lost count of the number of reckless impatient drivers (cars, vans, buses and taxis) that have nearly or actually knocked me off of my bicycle.</p>	

Segregation between cyclist and pedestrians

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>"Cycleway over bridge at pavement level segregated by kerb": Not sure what is meant by "kerb" here, but if it's just a shallow bump, from experience it will most certainly mean pedestrians casually invading the cycle lanes when you least expect it. Why not keep on same level with road, or raise the pedestrians further?</p>	<p>The Camden kerb is being used around structures where the design has affected our ability to provide a full segregation. Improved footway will reinforce the difference between the footway and the cycleway and encourage both pedestrians and cyclist to use there area. There will be a change in footway material will provide clear visual distinction from cycleway</p>
<p>Looks great. I particularly like that the cycle lanes are separated from traffic. I also like that the narrower roads will encourage people out of their cars and onto public transport. My only concern is with the proximity between the cycle lanes and the pedestrian walkways. I'm hoping that there is some kind of separation (even small) so that pedestrians don't stray into the paths of bikes.</p>	

Section 15. Redriff Road (between Surrey Quays Road to Brunswick Quay)



Clean and tidy

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>It will be good to remove the mini-roundabout as drivers mostly go straight over it anyway. It should reduce speeds. Good to remove the bus stop as it just causes delays for other traffic plus nuisance for residents with noise and rubbish thrown over fences by bus users.</p>	
<p>1. Traffic signals will significantly slow down local buses in the area, which are already very slow and it takes a long while to get to the nearest tube/overground stations. This adds a lot to overall commute time.</p> <p>2. Rotherhithe Street is very narrow and it's really struggling with 2 way traffic at peak times. A cycle track will only make the situation worse.</p> <p>3. The increased number of cyclists in the area will make it less safe for walking, especially for children and parents with a buggy, it will also increase the amount of garbage on the streets and will likely lead to the increased crime rate too.</p>	<p>It is not considered likely that the introduction of a cycle route will lead to a deterioration in the cleanliness or tidiness of the area</p>

Improve air quality	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Cycle lane is meaningless in a street that is 1 lane each direction. Will increase traffic and queuing and increase pollution	The provision of safer cycle facilities will give people the opportunity to cycle rather than drive, which will assist in the improvement of air quality
it's not a very busy road so not sure a traffic signal is needed? Will only cause more traffic / cars standing still therefore more pollution	
I do not support any plan that seeks to encourage cyclists onto the roads carrying buses and lorries and major traffic flows . This is only encouraging them onto the roads with the traffic most likely to kill them. Better to create cycle routes by the river or through parks and nature reserve. Or failing that through side streets. Messing up Redriff road for traffic will create higher pollution .	
Ooops. No chance of ever moving along the road then. My God, my asthma problem is guaranteed to get far worse than it is already. Loss of ai-cleaning trees as well. UTTERLY GHASTLY.	
Concerned that lower speed will increase air pollution.	
The amount of traffic signals seems excessive. Stationary gas vehicles will lead to worse air quality	
traffic light will cause pollution Traffic light will delay the greenest people on foot People who cycle tend to go through red lights – how are you going to stop this – MAKE A LAW THAT ALL CCYLES MUST HAVE A NUMNBER PLATE BUS STOP MUST NOT BE REMOVED.... THIS IS NOT A CHANGE FOR THE GOO.. IT WIL HELL FOR THE LCOAL PEOPLE	
Strongly opposing the removal of the mini roundabout. Adding traffic lights here does not make sense and will create more pollution. This is a low traffic area, traffic lights will make cars and motorbikes wait for no reason. Cycling traffic here is also non existent so this will be a waste of money.	

Crossing roads is easy and safe	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Good to see better crossings for pedestrians</p> <p>Looks much safer for cyclists and pedestrians</p>	
<p>The placement of the Zebra crossing matches the path from Brunswick Quay and the pedestrian entrance to the cinema. It should be kept where it is. People will cross here anyway rather than needlessly walking to your proposed new crossing.</p> <p>There is also not enough traffic or footfall on this area to warrant a signalled pedestrian crossing here. The zebra crossing works just fine.</p> <p>I also strongly oppose the removal of the mini roundabout. This is not a busy junction and traffic signals will just cause delays. The roundabout works extremely well right now. You seem obsessed with signals throughout all the recent plans.</p> <p>I also strongly oppose the kerb on the segregated cycleway. This will make crossing the road with a pram very difficult.</p> <p>I personally do not use this bus stop, but why is it removed? Where do brunswick quay residents get their bus?</p> <p>I also strongly oppose the kerb on the segregated cycleway. This will make crossing the road with a pram very difficult.</p>	<p>The new crossing point is x metres from the existing crossing and will cater for those pedestrians heading towards Surrey Quays Road. The entrance into this site will no longer exist once this area is developed. So this design future proofs works when developments take place</p> <p>A zebra crossing so close to a signal junction would cause confusion and as a result would be unsafe</p> <p>New crossing are proposed along the route to allow pedestrians to cross Redriff Road and Salter Road</p>
<p>1. Traffic signals will significantly slow down local buses in the area, which are already very slow and it takes a long while to get to the nearest tube/overground stations. This adds a lot to overall commute time.</p> <p>2. Rotherhithe Street is very narrow and it's really struggling with 2 way traffic at peak times. A cycle track will only make the situation worse.</p> <p>3. The increased number of cyclists in the area will make it less safe for walking, especially for children and parents with a buggy, it will also increase the amount of garbage on the streets and will likely lead to the increased crime rate too.</p>	<p>There is no reason why a cycleway should make the road less safe for pedestrians. The road width is generally being reduced, which will slow vehicle speeds and thereby lower the risk to pedestrians. In addition the proposal overall provide additional controlled crossings</p>

Cyclist behaviour & keep off pavements	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
I hope that the bus stop removal will be replaced with another bus stop close by and also that the cyclists will be policed - my experience is that they mount the pavement and are aggressive and will not stop at traffic lights	The provision of a segregated cycle route, should encourage cyclists on to the route as opposed to the footway
<p>traffic light will cause pollution</p> <p>Traffic light will delay the greenest people on foot</p> <p>People who cycle tend to go through red lights – how are you going to stop this – MAKE A LAW THAT ALL CCYLES MUST HAVE A NUMNER PLATE</p> <p>BUS STOP MUST NOT BE REMOVED....</p> <p>THIS IS NOT A CHANGE FOR THE GOO.. IT WIL HELL FOR THE LCOAL PEOPLE</p>	

Do not agree with traffic calming/reduction and cycle lanes	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Cycle lane is meaningless in a street that is 1 lane each direction. Will increase traffic and queuing and increase pollution	The provision of safer cycling facilities is a priority for the Council. This proposal allows us to link existing and proposed cycle routes. These proposals will give people the opportunity to cycle local journeys as well journeys further afield.
Traffic light is unnecessary.	
No need for a separated two way cycle track (and I am a cyclist and use the road every day). The road is already safe with very limited trafic and speed is limited at 20mph. You would better ensure the speed limit is respected.	
DO NOT CUT TREES or if you do plant more than you cut !	
There is absolutely no need for an additional traffic light crossing here, nor a segregated cycle way. There are many crossings in this area and traffic is not busy enough here to justify the money and materials. I walk through this area on my daily commute.	

<p>Cycle lanes are a waste of money & cyclists are not mandated to use them. This money should be spent on the majority not the minority. And the loss of trees is hypocrisy!</p>	
<p>Do not see the need for this cycle route, there is enough already within the Peninsular</p>	
<p>The road layout seems to work well at the moment. I cannot see any real benefit to the changes. Redriff/Salter Road has good visibility with grass verges along most of its length making it already safe for pedestrians and cyclists. Also the road currently does not seem to have much traffic.</p> <p>This road is already one of the most pleasant and safe in the area, I just do not think that this scheme justifies the cost.</p>	
<p>I support the swap of the mini roundabout for traffic signals as this mini roundabout is frequently ignored and I have been overtaken by other cars on this roundabout when I have been going around it and they have ignored it.</p> <p>I do not think there is a need for a cycle lane at all. This is not a busy road and is nice and wide and sufficient for all the users.</p> <p>The bus stop is seldom used and is probably surplus to requirement.</p>	
<p>Cycle lane NO</p>	
<p>STOP TRYING TO CREATE CYCLEWAYS</p>	
<p>Traffic signals will cause additiona delays in traffic movement for no good reason.</p> <p>No Bridge in Rotherhithe street - no need for a cycle route.</p> <p>Almost no cyclists using route now, this will not change. Cycle lane not required.</p>	
<p>Not needed, waste of money</p>	

<p>I do not support any plan that seeks to encourage cyclists onto the roads carrying buses and lorries and major traffic flows . This is only encouraging them onto the roads with the traffic most likely to kill them .</p> <p>Better to create cycle routes by the river or through parks and nature reserve . Or failing that through side streets.</p> <p>Messing up Redriff road for traffic will create higher pollution .</p>	<p>The facilities at this location are segregated so the risk of vehicle cycle collision is significantly reduced</p>
--	---

Easy and safe to cycle	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Principle of promoting cycling is supported. Cycle lanes generally seem quite narrow, and would ideally be wider. Concerned by side roads pulling out into two way cycle traffic. These number of roads pulling out into cycle lanes should be limited to as few as possible to minimise the chance of collisions.</p>	<p>The width of the cycleway has been dictated by available space and the desire to minimise its effects particularly with regards to trees</p>
<p>Is it possible to also place a cycle lane along surrey quays road? even if its not segregated, a marking on the road would be beneficial.</p>	<p>This will be investigated</p>
<p>"New flat top road hump for cyclists": Why is this necessary?</p> <p>Why remove the "left"-most trees? These are mature trees.</p>	<p>The flat top hump is to avoid the expense of relocating a BT cover. This will be further explored during detailed design.</p>

<p>The placement of the Zebra crossing matches the path from Brunswick Quay and the pedestrian entrance to the cinema. It should be kept where it is. People will cross here anyway rather than needlessly walking to your proposed new crossing.</p> <p>There is also not enough traffic or footfall on this area to warrant a signalled pedestrian crossing here. The zebra crossing works just fine.</p> <p>I also strongly oppose the removal of the mini roundabout. This is not a busy junction and traffic signals will just cause delays. The roundabout works extremely well right now. You seem obsessed with signals throughout all the recent plans.</p> <p>I also strongly oppose the kerb on the segregated cycleway. This will make crossing the road with a pram very difficult.</p> <p>I personally do not use this bus stop, but why is it removed? Where do brunswick quay residents get their bus?</p> <p>I also strongly oppose the kerb on the segregated cycleway. This will make crossing the road with a pram very difficult.</p>	<p>New crossings have been proposed at regular intervals to allow pedestrians to cross Redriff Road and Salter Road</p>
<p>Great to have segregated cycling - essentially if cyclists are to feel safe.</p>	
<p>This stretch is not cyclist-friendly at present and full of speeding and rat-running motor vehicles.</p>	
<p>Looks much safer for cyclists and pedestrains</p>	
<p>Strongly support the cycle track, though loss of trees is sad.</p>	
<p>great cycle route</p>	
<p>more cycleways please</p>	
<p>Loss of two trees is sad but segregated cycle path is most important</p>	
<p>Segregated cycle lanes are a must when cycling with young children</p>	

<p>I think its extremely important to segregate cycle lanes from the rest of traffic. I have been commuting by bicycle on this road for nearly ten years and I have lost count of the number of reckless impatient drivers (cars, vans, buses and taxis) that have nearly or actually knocked me off of my bicycle.</p>	
<p>These changes Segregated two-way cycleway on the eastside of Redriff Road</p> <p>Access to and from Surrey Quays Road via signal controlled junction and advanced stop line</p> <p>Cycle priority provided across Brunswick Quay through raised junction to reduce the speed of turning traffic will make it safer for cyclists.</p>	
<p>Good to have separate cycle route and if you can't sort out a dedicated proper cycling route and put cyclist on road, good to have an advance light.</p> <p>But buffer zone, this needs planting, could be integrated suds system.</p> <p>The tactile paving and the whole look seems rather ugly . Are you going to do something more upmarket and well designed so that it doesn't look like a dog's dinner.</p> <p>Using contrasting colours for visually impaired instead of cheap buff and red paving, which isn't good for people with poor vision.</p> <p>Planted verges and more trees...it looks very harsh.</p>	
<p>Will be safer having a segregated cycle lane.</p>	

Enjoyable environment

Comments and or suggestions

Response



Above the two trees that need to be removed. The blue arrow indicates the potential position of a new tree

There are a lot of daffodils planted under the grass verge on this section. I am not clear whether you plan to reduce the width of these verges or dig them up, but it would be a shame to lose the daffodils. If the contractors are due to dig up the verges or reduce their width can they be asked to put the daffodil bulbs to one side and then replace them when they put the earth back again?

The verge is slightly narrowed at this point the daffodils look like they are close to the kerb. New daffodils will be replanted

Traffic light is unnecessary.

No need for a separated two way cycle track (and I am a cyclist and use the road every day). The road is already safe with very limited traffic and speed is limited at 20mph. You would better ensure the speed limit is respected.

DO NOT CUT TREES or if you do plant more than you cut !

Two trees are affected within this section and one location for a new tree has been identified. The designs developed to date we have taken great care to minimise the loss of trees.

This section has the most mature trees for this reason the widths of the road, cycleway and footways have been reduced to a minimum to ensure the trees are not affected. We have already carried out trial and hand digs around roots to inform our current design.

Cycle lanes are a waste of money & cyclists are not mandated to use them. This money should be spent on

At the next design stage we will continue this and investigate opportunities to plant additional trees

<p>the majority not the minority. And the loss of trees is hypocrisy!</p>	
<p>Don't cut the trees down</p>	
<p>I strongly oppose the removal of trees from this section of road and also narrowing the road - which will cause difficulties when two buses in different directions meet on this section of road. It also will cause many difficulties for locals if the Brunswick Quay stop is removed, as this is the nearest stop for a variety of people who live around the area - it is a 350m walk to Onega Gate and a 260m walk involving crossing Redriff Road to Surrey Quays Leisure Park - this shall cause difficulties for those who find it hard to walk long distances and who rely on buses as a means of transport.</p> <p>I have no objection to the replacement of the Surrey Quays Road roundabout with traffic signals.</p>	
<p>Is there a need to remove those trees?</p>	
<p>More trees not less. If 15 are being felled 9 is not a replacement. Should be 45.</p>	
<p>These plans look great! As long as the grassy surface on the left hand side of the artist's impressions can be retained.</p>	
<p>Strongly support the cycle track, though loss of trees is sad.</p>	
<p>If two tree will be removed the council should have at least 4 new trees in the area.</p>	
<p>I oppose the changes because it means the loss of a significant green verge and many trees. I know the plan notes that there will be a net gain in trees, but these will be in different locations to those that will be removed. This will change the quality of the street and walking environment. More trees, planting and landscaping should be provided to mitigate the proposed loss, not elsewhere but in the same locations and proximity to the loss.</p>	
<p>I like the segregated cycleway but I am concerned by the two pedestrian crossings that cut across it. Could it not be like the Cycleway on the Embankment where there is a seperate crossing for the cycleway and for the roads? In practice pedestrians can safely cross the Cycleway there without pressing the crossing button in most cases,</p>	

<p>preventing the cyclists from having to stop. They can then use the pedestrian crossing which stops the traffic on the road, thus prioritising cycle and pedestrians over motorised vehicles.</p> <p>Also surely it is possible to plant another small tree so at least there is no net loss? This is the kind of thing environmentalists would kick off about. If you planted two more small trees then you could sell it as 'a net gain' of trees.</p>		
<p>Ooops. No chance of ever moving along the road then. My God, my asthma problem is guaranteed to get far worse than it is already. Loss of ai-cleaning trees as well. UTTERLY GHASTLY.</p>		
<p>Pavement should not be narrowed. They are already not that wide. I see more people wearing with buggies than cyclists. Bus stop should not be removed nor trees.</p>		
<p>Disagree with the introduction of traffic signals. Unnecessary and will slow down and interrupt movement.</p> <p>Disagree with tree removal.</p>		
<p>"New flat top road hump for cyclists": Why is this necessary?</p> <p>Why remove the "left"-most trees? These are mature trees.</p>		
<p>I oppose the removal of the trees.</p>		
<p>Oppose the removal of mature trees</p>		
<p>Loss of two trees is sad but segregated cycle path is most important</p>		
<p>Please plant an extra replacement tree as close as possible</p>		
<p>Please consider planting more trees</p>		
<p>Good to have separate cycle route and if you can't sort out a dedicated proper cycling route and put cyclist on road, good to have an advance light.</p> <p>But buffer zone, this needs planting, could be integrated suds system.</p>		<p>The buffer zone is only 0.5metres wide and is of sufficient width to accommodate planting</p>

<p>The tactile paving and the whole look seems rather ugly . Are you going to do something more upmarket and well designed so that it doesn't look like a dog's dinner.</p> <p>Using contrasting colours for visually impaired instead of cheap buff and red paving, which isn't good for people with poor vision.</p> <p>Planted verges and more trees...it looks very harsh.</p>	
---	--

Improved cyclist behaviours	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I hope that the bus stop removal will be replaced with another bus stop close by and also that the cyclists will be policed - my experience is that they mount the pavement and are aggressive and will not stop at traffic lights</p>	

Improved junctions and/or traffic lights designs and phasing	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Good to see better crossings for pedestrians</p>	
Brunswick Quay Junction	
<p>Principle of promoting cycling is supported. Cycle lanes generally seem quite narrow, and would ideally be wider. Concerned by side roads pulling out into two way cycle traffic. These number of roads pulling out into cycle lanes should be limited to as few as possible to minimise the chance of collisions.</p>	<p>The design of the minor junctions (Brunswick Quay) where they meet\ cross the Cycleway, is governed by the availability of road space. The designs have incorporated raised surfaces, small radius at the junction and continuation of the segregation as close to the junction as possible. At the detailed design stage this will be checked again.</p>
<p>Risk of vehicles turning into Brunswick Quay colliding with people on bikes. The turning radius is not tight enough meaning that drivers can't see cyclists approaching from 'behind' them as they turn. Either the turning radius needs to be tighter by extending the protective kerb nearer the junction or setting the cycleway further back from Redriff Road so that drivers approach the cycleway at 90 degree angle.</p>	<p>Once works commence a public awareness programme will take place, explaining to local residents how these junction layout should used.</p>

<p>This looks fantastic. I would also like to see something which gives drivers more warning that they will be crossing a cycleway when they turn into Brunswick Quay. Perhaps a different coloured road surface or warning signs on the lead up to the junction.</p>	
<p>With the bend on Redriff Road, drivers coming out of Brunswick Quay already find it hard enough to exit. It will be hard to see cyclists coming as there are blind spots with the curve of the road. It will become a black spot for accidents. Also how are the busses and Lorries going to fit. Road is not wide enough?</p> <p>Also with the new development being given the go ahead how will the delivery vehicles get along the road to the new intended entrance?</p>	
<p>Against Traffic Lights at Surrey Quays Road</p>	
<p>Traffic light is unnecessary.</p> <p>No need for a separated two way cycle track (and I am a cyclist and use the road every day). The road is already safe with very limited traffic and speed is limited at 20mph. You would better ensure the speed limit is respected.</p> <p>DO NOT CUT TREES or if you do plant more than you cut !</p>	<p>The existing roundabout caters for motorised traffic, however, roundabouts do not always cater for the needs of the more vulnerable road users such as cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>The provision of traffic signals allows us to provide crossing across each arm of the junction. The demand would be dependant on pedestrian use.</p> <p>The provision of the traffic signals also allows us to design safer and easier access and egress to the cycle route, which is not possible with a roundabout control.</p>
<p>There is absolutely no need for an additional traffic light crossing here, nor a segregated cycle way. There are many crossings in this area and traffic is not busy enough here to justify the money and materials. I walk through this area on my daily commute.</p>	
<p>only concern is lights replacing roundabout which is fine during peak times but seems unnecessary at all other times (next junctions with lights very close by). will pedestrian crossing be at request only?</p>	
<p>There does not need to be more traffic lights added anywhere along this street, the current zebra crossings work well and avoid unnecessary traffic!</p>	
<p>it's not a very busy road so not sure a traffic signal is needed? Will only cause more traffic / cars standing still therefore more pollution.</p>	

<p>The amount of traffic signals seems excessive. Stationary gas vehicles will lead to worse air quality</p>	
<p>Disagree with the introduction of traffic signals. Unnecessary and will slow down and interrupt movement.</p> <p>Disagree with tree removal.</p>	
<p>Additional set of traffic lights unnecessary</p>	
<p>Mini-roundabout would be better than traffic lights, as traffic coming through this junction varies dramatically and most traffic is left-turning. I oppose the removal of the bus stop.</p>	
<p>I oppose bus stop removal. I also oppose removal of mini roundabout as this will lead to increased travel times and frustration, given the number of traffic lights in the plan and in an area of too few cyclists.</p> <p>I oppose cycle priority across side road at Brunswick Quay.</p>	
<p>Strongly opposing the removal of the mini roundabout. Adding traffic lights here does not make sense and will create more pollution. This is a low traffic area, traffic lights will make cars and motorbikes wait for no reason. Cycling traffic here is also non-existent so this will be a waste of money.</p>	
<p>Traffic signals will cause additional delays in traffic movement for no good reason.</p> <p>No Bridge in Rotherhithe street - no need for a cycle route.</p> <p>Almost no cyclists using route now, this will not change. Cycle lane not required.</p>	
<p>The roundabout works perfectly Traffic lights mean more congestion</p>	
<p>I don't think there is a need for traffic lights, there are other ways of naturally slowing down vehicles and prioritising pedestrians such as raised zebra crossings, narrowed roads, speed bumps and planting. This feels like a very engineered way of addressing this problem. Bring in an urban designer and landscape person?</p>	

<p>The placement of the Zebra crossing matches the path from Brunswick Quay and the pedestrian entrance to the cinema. It should be kept where it is. People will cross here anyway rather than needlessly walking to your proposed new crossing.</p> <p>There is also not enough traffic or footfall on this area to warrants a signalled pedestrian crossing here. The zebra crossing works just fine.</p> <p>I also strongly oppose the removal of the mini roundabout. This is not a busy junction and traffic signals will just cause delays. The roundabout works extremely well right now. You seem obsessed with signals throughout all the recent plans.</p> <p>I also strongly oppose the kerb on the segregated cycleway. This will make crossing the road with a pram very difficult.</p> <p>I personally do not use this bus stop, but why is it removed? Where do brunswick quay residents get their bus?</p> <p>I also strongly oppose the kerb on the segregated cycleway. This will make crossing the road with a pram very difficult.</p>	
<p>Don't like existing roundabouts</p>	
<p>It will be good to remove the mini-roundabout as drivers mostly go straight over it anyway. It should reduce speeds. Good to remove the bus stop as it just causes delays for other traffic plus nuisance for residents with noise and rubbish thrown over fences by bus users.</p>	

<p>I support the swap of the mini roundabout for traffic signals as this mini roundabout is frequently ignored and I have been overtaken by other cars on this roundabout when I have been going around it and they have ignored it.</p> <p>I do not think there is a need for a cycle lane at all. This is not a busy road and is nice and wide and sufficient for all the users.</p> <p>The bus stop is seldom used and is probably surplus to requirement.</p> <p>I use the zebra crossing a lot. Is it necessary to switch it?.</p> <p>Considering that a large number of motorists wanting to carry straight on Redriff Rd ignore the existing roundabout I think this is the only solution.</p>	
<p>Prefer Zebra crossings</p>	
<p>Would prefer to see zebra crossings instead of signalised crossings, as both a cyclist and pedestrian.</p> <p>We do not need traffic lights to cause traffic, there should be zebra crossings.</p> <p>I think it would be better to leave the zebra crossing as it is and not replace with a signalled pedestrian crossing. From my experience as a pedestrian, cyclist and motorist, there would isn't enough usage of the crossing here to justify a signalled crossing to continuously hold traffic/cyclists. A zebra crossing would also reduce costs.</p>	<p>The provision of traffic signal as opposed to zebra crossing allows us to provide for cyclists too. The design allows safer and easier access and egress at Surrey Quays Road</p>
<p>Traffic Signal operation</p>	
<p>The early release for cycles from Surrey Quays Road should begin at the start of Phase 2 of the staging diagram, as there would be no need for cycles to be held at red during this phase, only motor traffic. An example of this can be found at the Buckingham Gate/Birdcage Walk junction that was implemented as part of CS3, where eastbound cycles get an early release during the phase for westbound cycles.</p>	<p>The operation of the traffic signals will be discussed and agreed with TfL. We will aim to install the latest technologies that give us the optimum performance for all road users</p>


<p>If cyclist could proceed when safe to do so this would be acceptable. Otherwise it just delays cyclist and the safety benefits do not outweigh this. I cannot imagine there are many recordings of cyclist incidents. This data has not been provided. crossings work well and avoid unnecessary traffic!</p>	
<p>I strongly support these proposals, ESPECIALLY the cycle early release greenlight from Surrey Quays Road on to the proposed route. I think the early release is essential to ensure inexperienced cyclists or young children can make the most of this route.</p>	
<p>I like the segregated cycleway but I am concerned by the two pedestrian crossings that cut across it. Could it not be like the Cycleway on the Embankment where there is a separate crossing for the cycleway and for the roads? In practice pedestrians can safely cross the Cycleway there without pressing the crossing button in most cases, preventing the cyclists from having to stop. They can then use the pedestrian crossing which stops the traffic on the road, thus prioritising cycle and pedestrians over motorised vehicles.</p> <p>Also surely it is possible to plant another small tree so at least there is no net loss? This is the kind of thing environmentalists would kick off about. If you planted two more small trees then you could sell it as 'a net gain' of trees.</p>	<p>There insufficient road space to allow pedestrians to cross in two stages, furthermore cyclists are only held on a red light when the pedestrian phase is activated, so this is the only time cyclists are held up.</p>

Improved public transport
(reliability, more & direct routes, accessibility, overcrowding)

Comments and or suggestions

Response

Concern over the loss of the bus stop



I hope that the bus stop removal will be replaced with another bus stop close by and also that the cyclists will be policed - my experience is that they mount the pavement and are aggressive and will not stop at traffic lights

Losing the bus stop means it is a longer walk for a local resident to catch a bus. Can the road be widened for a short length on the opposite side next to the car park to allow the bus to still stop here? The road would be kinked slowing traffic.

To provide a segregated cycle route, bus stops are designed to be on the main carriageway with the cycleway behind the bus stop. At this location this has not been possible, as we wanted to minimise the effect on the tress on the opposite side of the road.

The diagram above shows the existing stops circled in red. The spacing between the two bus stops will now be 590m, we have looked at trying to reduce this distance by moving these stops but this isn't feasible.

<p>I strongly oppose the removal of trees from this section of road and also narrowing the road - which will cause difficulties when two buses in different directions meet on this section of road. It also will cause many difficulties for locals if the Brunswick Quay stop is removed, as this is the nearest stop for a variety of people who live around the area - it is a 350m walk to Onega Gate and a 260m walk involving crossing Redriff Road to Surrey Quays Leisure Park - this shall cause difficulties for those who find it hard to walk long distances and who rely on buses as a means of transport.</p> <p>I have no objection to the replacement of the Surrey Quays Road roundabout with traffic signals.</p>	<p>Tfl have provided us with data showing the use of these stops</p>
<p>Pavement should not be narrowed. They are already not that wide. I see more people wearing with buggies than cyclists. Bus stop should not be removed nor trees.</p>	
<p>traffic light will cause pollution</p> <p>Traffic light will delay the greenest people on foot</p> <p>People who cycle tend to go through red lights – how are you going to stop this – MAKE A LAW THAT ALL CCYLES MUST HAVE A NUMNBER PLATE</p> <p>BUS STOP MUST NOT BE REMOVED....</p> <p>THIS IS NOT A CHANGE FOR THE GOO.. IT WIL HELL FOR THE LCOAL PEOPLE</p>	
<p>I don't agree with removing the bus stop, this hinders the residents. Narrower roads won't reduce traffic speed, it will only frustrate the traffic. Most of the time its motorbikes that speed and narrower roads doesn't stop them.</p>	
<p>Mini-roundabout would be better than traffic lights, as traffic coming through this junction varies dramatically and most traffic is left-turning. I oppose the removal of the bus stop.</p>	

<p>I oppose bus stop removal. I also oppose removal of mini roundabout as this will lead to increased travel times and frustration, given the number of traffic lights in the plan and in an area of too few cyclists.</p> <p>I oppose cycle priority across side road at Brunswick Quay.</p>	
<p>The placement of the Zebra crossing matches the path from Brunswick Quay and the pedestrian entrance to the cinema. It should be kept where it is. People will cross here anyway rather than needlessly walking to your proposed new crossing.</p> <p>There is also not enough traffic or footfall on this area to warrant a signalled pedestrian crossing here. The zebra crossing works just fine.</p> <p>I also strongly oppose the removal of the mini roundabout. This is not a busy junction and traffic signals will just cause delays. The roundabout works extremely well right now. You seem obsessed with signals throughout all the recent plans.</p> <p>I also strongly oppose the kerb on the segregated cycleway. This will make crossing the road with a pram very difficult.</p> <p>I personally do not use this bus stop, but why is it removed? Where do Brunswick quay residents get their bus?</p> <p>I also strongly oppose the kerb on the segregated cycleway. This will make crossing the road with a pram very difficult.</p>	
<p>Supporting the removal of the bus stop</p>	
<p>It will be good to remove the mini-roundabout as drivers mostly go straight over it anyway. It should reduce speeds. Good to remove the bus stop as it just causes delays for other traffic plus nuisance for residents with noise and rubbish thrown over fences by bus users.</p>	

<p>I support the swap of the mini roundabout for traffic signals as this mini roundabout is frequently ignored and I have been overtaken by other cars on this roundabout when I have been going around it and they have ignored it.</p> <p>I do not think there is a need for a cycle lane at all. This is not a busy road and is nice and wide and sufficient for all the users.</p> <p>The bus stop is seldom used and is probably surplus to requirement.</p> <p>I use the zebra crossing a lot. Is it necessary to switch it?</p>	
---	--

Effects on buses	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic signals will significantly slow down local buses in the area, which are already very slow and it takes a long while to get to the nearest tube/overground stations. This adds a lot to overall commute time. 2. Rotherhithe Street is very narrow and it's really struggling with 2 way traffic at peak times. A cycle track will only make the situation worse. 3. The increased number of cyclists in the area will make it less safe for walking, especially for children and parents with a buggy, it will also increase the amount of garbage on the streets and will likely lead to the increased crime rate too. 	<p>There will be slight delays for buses, but this is considered to be expected by the introduction of traffic signals which will apportion time against demand. The junction is expected to work within capacity so no significant problems are expected</p>

More and safer cycle infrastructure/ routes	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Is it possible to also place a cycle lane along Surrey Quays Road? even if its not segregated, a marking on the road would be beneficial.</p>	<p>At this stage it is not possible to provide a cycle lane into Surrey Quays Road, an advance stop line is proposed in Surrey Quays Road.</p> <p>Future cycle routes will be explored as the area is redeveloped</p>
<p>Great to have segregated cycling - essentially if cyclists are to feel safe.</p>	
<p>more cycleways please</p>	

Other	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
There should be no reduction in motor vehicle carriageway width as a result of introducing a cycle track.	The introduction of a facility for cyclists will require a segregated facility; such a facility should benefit all. Providing such a facility will provide safer environment to cycle away from traffic. The loss of carriageway space will not reduce capacity at should have no direct effect on motorised vehicles
Let's have as few curbs as possible. Use tactile paving instead of curbs to demarcate the border between the road and the pavement. If you are going to put in curbs, then those curbs should be bevelled. Non-bevelled curbs are a extreme danger to cyclists. TfL has started beveling the curbs on its cycle lanes. Please do the same. Thank you.	Bevelled kerbs will be used on this project

River crossings	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
No bridge no need for route.. WHITE ELEPHANT.	This proposal aims to link to existing and proposed routes in the area and provide a link to Cycleway 4. It will also provide a key local route to local facilities and destinations further afield. A ferry option is still being investigated should this be taken forward this proposal will complement the crossing.
Why a cycle lane? Even if a bridge were to be built (which is the whole idea of the route) the cycle route should be around the docks to lower rd and across the woodlands to Jamaica rd, not up the side of Redriff Rd.	
Traffic signals will cause additional delays in traffic movement for no good reason. No Bridge in Rotherhithe street - no need for a cycle route. Almost no cyclists using route now, this will not change. Cycle lane not required.	

Segregated space for walking, cycling & driving

Comments and or suggestions	Response
I think its extremely important to segregate cycle lanes from the rest of traffic. I have been commuting by bicycle on this road for nearly ten years and I have lost count of the number of reckless impatient drivers (cars, vans, buses and taxies) that have nearly or actually knocked me off of my bicycle.	

Wider and well-maintained pavements/walking routes

Comments and or suggestions	Response
Pavement should not be narrowed. They are already not that wide. I see more people wearing with buggies than cyclists. Bus stop should not be removed nor trees.	The footway width is being reduced on the eastside of Redriff Road. The footway on the west side is unaffected

Section 16. Redriff Road (Quebec Way)



Active travel to school

Comments and or suggestions	Response
Strongly support the enhancement for cyclists using Quebec Way to get to Alfred Salter School	

Clean and tidy

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>1. Traffic signals will significantly slow down local buses in the area, which are already very slow and it takes a long while to get to the nearest tube/overground stations. This adds a lot to overall commute time.</p> <p>2. Rotherhithe Street is very narrow and it's really struggling with 2 way traffic at peak times. A cycle</p>	<p>It is not considered likely that the introduction of a cycle route will lead to a deterioration in the cleanliness or tidiness of the area</p>

track will only make the situation worse.	
3. The increased number of cyclists in the area will make it less safe for walking, especially for children and parents with a buggy, it will also increase the amount of garbage on the streets and will likely lead to the increased crime rate too.	

Improve air quality	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>slowing the traffic and creating further jams by taking out road space to increase cycle routes will increase pollution.</p> <p>Buses and lorries will not reduce due to cycle routes - they will just be delayed and produce higher pollution.</p> <p>It is irresponsible of any council to seek to encourage cyclists onto major roads alongside buses and lorries , the vehicles most likely to kill them. The speed differential leaves them vulnerable anywhere where the cyclists cross the main carriageway .</p> <p>A responsible council would seek safer cycle routes along by the river , through the park or through side streets.</p> <p>The cycle routes in places like Willow walk are so well used precisely because they are away from the main roads like old Kent road</p>	<p>The provision of safer cycle facilities will give people the opportunity to cycle rather than drive, which will assist in the improvement of air quality</p>
<p>Oh dear. The third set of traffic lights stuck on red for ever, and I(am not yet even half way home from doing my shopping at the shopping centre. WILL THE COUNCIL BE PROVIDING ME WITH AN OXYGEN CYLINDER IN MY CAR SO THAT I DON'T DIE FROM THE AIR POLLUTION BEFORE I CAN EVEN GET HOME???</p>	
<p>Hope lower speed won't increase air pollution.</p>	

<p>Traffic lights slow down vehicular movement and create pollution with adverse impact on air quality.</p> <p>And cyclists do not observe red lights making it dangerous to pedestrians who legitimately cross when the green man is shown .</p> <p>There will be no enforcement of anonymous cyclists who commit these offences.</p>	
<p>The amount of traffic signals seems excessive. Stationary gas vehicles will lead to worse air quality</p>	
<p>Strongly opposing the removal of the mini roundabout. Adding traffic lights here does not make sense and will create more pollution. This is a low traffic area, traffic lights will make cars and motorbikes wait for no reason. Cycling traffic here is also non existent so this will be a waste of money.</p>	

Crossing roads is easy and safe	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>We do not need any more traffic lights. Zebra crossings should be used, there is no need to create traffic.</p>	<p>This location requires traffic signal control and would not be able to function as a simple priority junction with zebra crossings</p>
<p>Would prefer to see zebra crossings instead of signalised crossings, as both a cyclist and pedestrian.</p>	
<p>I strongly oppose the removal of the roundabout. This is not a busy junction and does not need to be signalised. It will simply cause needless delay.</p> <p>I also strongly oppose the kerb on the segregated cycleway. This will make crossing the road with a pram very difficult. I also strongly oppose the kerb on the segregated cycleway. This will make crossing the road with a pram very difficult.</p>	<p>Seven additional crossing points are being provide along this route. On this section the junction has two signalised phases across the junction to assist pedestrians crossing</p>

Ideally the signalised crossing on Quebec Way would be closer to the Redriff Road desire line.	The proposed crossing location is closer to the pedestrian desire line. Moving any closer toward Redriff Road increase the width of the crossing that means pedestrian are in the carriageway longer, which in turns increase overall delays for all road users.
--	--

Cyclist behaviour & keep off pavements	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Traffic lights slow down vehicular movement and create pollution with adverse impact on air quality.</p> <p>And cyclists do not observe red lights making it dangerous to pedestrians who legitimately cross when the green man is shown .</p> <p>There will be no enforcement of anonymous cyclists who commit these offences.</p>	

Do not agree with traffic calming/reduction and cycle lanes	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Cycle lane is meaningless in a street that is 1 lane each direction. Will increase traffic and queuing and increase pollution</p> <p>No need for a traffic light.</p> <p>No need for a separated two way cycle track (and I am a cyclist and use the road every day). The road is already safe with very limited traffic and speed is limited at 20mph. You would better ensure the speed limit is respected.</p> <p>DO NOT CUT TREES or if you do plant more than you cut !</p> <p>Cycle lanes are a waste of money & cyclists are not mandated to use them. This money should be spent on the majority not the minority. And the loss of trees is hypocrisy!</p>	<p>The provision of safer cycling facilities is a priority for the Council. This proposal allows us to link existing and proposed cycle routes. These proposals will give people the opportunity to cycle local journeys as well journeys further afield.</p>

The road narrowing along this stretch will cause issues when two large vehicles such as buses meet in opposite directions.

However, I have no opposition to the removal of the Quebec Way roundabout and the replacement with traffic signals.

slowing the traffic and creating further jams by taking out road space to increase cycle routes will increase pollution.

Buses and lorries will not reduce due to cycle routes - they will just be delayed and produce higher pollution.

It is irresponsible of any council to seek to encourage cyclists onto major roads alongside buses and lorries , the vehicles most likely to kill them. The speed differential leaves them vulnerable anywhere where the cyclists cross the main carriageway .

A responsible council would seek safer cycle routes along by the river , through the park or through side streets.

The cycle routes in places like Willow walk are so well used precisely because they are away from the main roads like old Kent road

<p>1. Traffic signals will significantly slow down local buses in the area, which are already very slow and it takes a long while to get to the nearest tube/overground stations. This adds a lot to overall commute time.</p> <p>2. Rotherhithe Street is very narrow and it's really struggling with 2 way traffic at peak times. A cycle track will only make the situation worse.</p> <p>3. The increased number of cyclists in the area will make it less safe for walking, especially for children and parents with a buggy, it will also increase the amount of garbage on the streets and will likely lead to the increased crime rate too.</p>	
<p>Do not see the need for this cycle route, there is enough already within the Peninsular</p>	
<p>The road layout seems to work well at the moment. I cannot see any real benefit to the changes. Redriff/Salter Road has good visibility with grass verges along most of its length making it already safe for pedestrians and cyclists. Also the road currently does not seem to have much traffic.</p> <p>This road is already one of the most pleasant and safe in the area, I just do not think that this scheme justifies the cost.</p>	
<p>Cycle lane not necessary. The road is wide enough for safe cycling and cars.</p> <p>Disagree with removal of roundabouts. Many cars drive very fast around Redriff road and the roundabout forces them to slow down. As a pedestrian with young children I am always relieved when cars and motorbikes that are speeding slow down at that point.</p>	
<p>Please no more cycle lane</p>	

<p>As before. The roundabouts work for a freer flow of traffic which benefits those who live here. Traffic lights are a bad idea.</p> <p>(Why a cycle lane? Even if a bridge were to be built (which is the whole idea of the route) the cycle route should be around the docks to lower rd and across the woodlands to Jamaica rd, not up the side of Redriff Rd.</p> <p>Where are the benefits in this whole plan to; a local residents, b. Pedestrians, c. bus users. d car drivers?)</p>	
<p>There should be no reduction in motor vehicle carriageway width as a result of introducing a cycle track.</p>	

Easy and safe to cycle	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>This looks much safer for walking and cycling. I would feel good about my children cycling on these cyclepaths</p>	
<p>The segregated cycling is great and essential to the whole scheme. It's the only way to make cyclists feel safe and increase participation.</p>	
<p>This stretch is not cyclist-friendly at present and full of speeding and rat-running motor vehicles.</p>	
<p>more cycleways please</p>	
<p>segregated cycle lanes are a must when cycling with young children</p>	
<p>Strongly support the enhancement for cyclists using Quebec Way to get to Alfred Salter School.</p>	
<p>I think its extremely important to segregate cycle lanes from the rest of traffic. I have been commuting by bicycle on this road for nearly ten years and I have lost count of the number of reckless impatient drivers (cars, vans, buses and taxis) that have nearly or actually knocked me off of my bicycle.</p>	

<p>These changes Segregated two-way cycleway on the east side of Redriff Road Access to and from Quebec Way via signal controlled junction Advance stop line on Quebec Way make its safer for cyclists.</p>	
<p>Will be safer having a segregated cycle lane.</p>	
<p>What is the reason for the flat top hump for cyclists on this section? Seems unnecessary as there is no hazard requiring cyclists to slow i.e. pedestrians crossing, junction etc.</p>	<p>The flat top hump is to avoid the expense of relocating a BT cover. This will be further explored during detailed design</p>
<p>Have you thought about changing the roundabout to a Dutch-style one that gives priority to cyclists? Otherwise I broadly support this section.</p> <p>However as in my answer to section 15, I guess it depends on volume of pedestrians, but surely you could have separate pedestrian crossings going over the Cycleway and the road? As I mentioned on the Cycleway on Embankment this allows cyclists to flow easily all the way along the road.</p> <p>I like the painted cycle tracks leading to and from Quebec Way from the Cycleway.</p> <p>(I like the segregated cycleway but I am concerned by the two pedestrian crossings that cut across it. Could it not be like the Cycleway on the Embankment where there is a separate crossing for the cycleway and for the roads? In practice pedestrians can safely cross the Cycleway there without pressing the crossing button in most cases, preventing the cyclists from having to stop. They can then use the pedestrian crossing which stops the traffic on the road, thus prioritising cycle and pedestrians over motorised vehicles.</p> <p>Also surely it is possible to plant another small tree so at least there is no net loss? This is the kind of thing environmentalists would kick off about. If you planted two more small trees then you could sell it as 'a net gain' of trees.)</p>	<p>Traffic signals were the preferred option that allowed a design that catered for all road users</p>

<p>If cyclist could proceed when safe to do so this would be acceptable. Otherwise it just delays cyclist and the safety benefits do not outweigh this. I cannot imagine there are many recordings of cyclist incidents. This data has not been provided.</p>	<p>There insufficient road space to allow pedestrians to cross in two stages, furthermore cyclists are only held on a red light when the pedestrian phase is activated, so this is the only time cyclists are held up.</p>
<p>As stated the danger of the cycle lane being on the wrong side. It would be safer to put the cycle lane on the opposite side on the road to Brunswick Quay due to the bend on Redriff road and the entrance to Brunswick Quay. There is more space on the opposite side to put the cycle lanes.</p> <p>A lot of the cyclists don't cycle along Redriff road. They use the under path to Greenland dock and cycle along Brunswick Quay to the top the they can join Rotherhithe Street from the top of the dock!</p>	<p>The choice of what side to located the Cycleway considered where there were potential conflicts, on balance it was considered as the most significant junctions were Deal Porters Way, Surrey Quays Road, Quebec Way and any additional accesses as a result of redevelopments were all on the west side, so to avoid these conflicts the cycleway has been proposed on the east side.</p>

Enjoyable environment

Comments and or suggestions

Response



The two trees that are effected

No need for a traffic light.

No need for a separated two way cycle track (and I am a cyclist and use the road every day). The road is already safe with very limited traffic and speed is limited at 20mph. You would better ensure the speed limit is respected.

DO NOT CUT TREES or if you do plant more than you cut !

Two trees are effected within this section and two new locations for a tree has been identified. The designs developed to date we have taken great care to minimise the loss of trees.

At the next design stage we will continue this and investigate opportunities to plant additional trees

<p>Cycle lanes are a waste of money & cyclists are not mandated to use them. This money should be spent on the majority not the minority. And the loss of trees is hypocrisy!</p>	
<p>Don't cut the trees down</p>	
<p>More trees not less. If 15 are being felled 9 is not a replacement. Should be 45.</p>	
<p>Any additional trees would be appreciated.</p>	
<p>If two trees will be removed the council should create space for at least 4 trees</p>	
<p>I oppose the changes because it means the loss of a significant green verge and many trees. I know the plan notes that there will be a net gain in trees, but these will be in different locations to those that will be removed. This will change the quality of the street and walking environment. More trees, planting and landscaping should be provided to mitigate the proposed loss, not elsewhere but in the same locations and proximity to the loss.</p>	

Have you thought about changing the roundabout to a Dutch-style one that gives priority to cyclists? Otherwise I broadly support this section.

However as in my answer to section 15, I guess it depends on volume of pedestrians, but surely you could have separate pedestrian crossings going over the Cycleway and the road? As I mentioned on the Cycleway on Embankment this allows cyclists to flow easily all the way along the road.

I like the painted cycle tracks leading to and from Quebec Way from the Cycleway.

(I like the segregated cycleway but I am concerned by the two pedestrian crossings that cut across it.

Could it not be like the Cycleway on the Embankment where there is a separate crossing for the cycleway and for the roads? In practice pedestrians can safely cross the Cycleway there without pressing the crossing button in most cases, preventing the cyclists from having to stop. They can then use the pedestrian crossing which stops the traffic on the road, thus prioritising cycle and pedestrians over motorised vehicles.

Also surely it is possible to plant another small tree so at least there is no net loss? This is the kind of thing environmentalists would kick off about. If you planted two more small trees then you could sell it as 'a net gain' of trees.)

<p>The removal of mature trees to be replaced with new small ones must be avoided to reduce the impact of heat and traffic and make the roads more liveable.</p> <p>In many sections of the project, there are wide new pavements that do not have tree cover, which should be considered.</p>	
<p>Pavement should not be narrowed. They are already not that wide. I see more people wearing with buggies than cyclists. Bus stop should not be removed nor trees.</p>	
<p>Leave trees where they are, I don't believe trees will be replaced (they are only proposed no guarantee).</p> <p>Double yellow lines will hinder deliveries and those with vehicles.</p>	
<p>Disagree with the introduction of traffic signals. Unnecessary and will slow down and interrupt movement. Disagree with tree removal.</p>	
<p>I oppose the removal of the trees</p>	
<p>The existing roundabout facilitates smooth traffic flow, I don't believe traffic lights are required at this junction.</p> <p>I oppose the removal of mature trees.</p>	
<p>Please plant an extra replacement tree as close as possible</p>	

<p>Lots of missed opportunities for planting.</p> <p>More trees.</p> <p>More hedging or suds planting. Even unmown grass.</p> <p>Wide swathes of paving are not necessary for pedestrians. Make it a more pleasant environment.</p> <p>Are there going to be sensibly placed bike racks along the way, where people may need to pop into shops etc.</p>	
<p>Strongly support the new junction and increased pavement.</p> <p>What's the need to remove the two trees?</p>	<p>The footway is being realigned at this location that would result in the trees being located in the carriageway. The proposed tree\ s can be relocated very close to the existing trees that have to be removed</p>
<p>Is it really necessary to fell a mature tree only to have a new one planted, like, 1.5 metres away?</p>	

Improved junctions and/or traffic lights designs and phasing

Comments and or suggestions	Response
Against traffic signals	
<p>I do not think it's necessary to replace this roundabout with a traffic light. Traffic lights in general reduces traffic flow and increases pollution and the traffic volume coming from Quebec road is extremely low. If a traffic light is needed, consider an activated signal instead of just a default setting otherwise, the traffic in Redriff road may be waiting for nothing at a red light here.</p>	<p>The existing roundabout caters for motorised traffic, however, roundabouts do not always cater for the needs of the more vulnerable road users such as cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>The provision of traffic signals allows us to provide crossing across each arm of the junction. The demand would be dependant on pedestrian use.</p> <p>The provision of the traffic signals also allows us to design safer and easier access and egress to the cycle route, which is not possible with a roundabout control.</p>
<p>No need for a traffic light.</p> <p>No need for a separated two way cycle track (and I am a cyclist and use the road every day). The road is already safe with very limited traffic and speed is limited at 20mph. You would better ensure the speed limit is respected.</p>	
<p>DO NOT CUT TREES or if you do plant more than you cut !</p>	

<p>I am not convinced that the volume of traffic using Quebec Way justifies the use of a signal controlled junction here. The other plans as part of the wider consultation show there are plans to introduce numerous other traffic lights and there is a risk the area will become inundated with traffic lights. I'm not sure why there can't just be a normal main road priority for Redriff road with Quebec way as a side road, with a island to help pedestrians crossing Quebec way?</p>	
<p>Concerns more generally about traffic lights replacing roundabouts as this will have significant impact on traffic flow</p>	
<p>I would like to see the roundabout kept as it means traffic, including bikes, can always continue their journey if free. I understand this change might be with concern to keeping cyclists safe though.</p>	
<p>Oh dear. The third set of traffic lights stuck on red for ever, and I(am not yet even half way home from doing my shopping at the shopping centre. WILL THE COUNCIL BE PROVIDING ME WITH AN OXYGEN CYLINDER IN MY CAR SO THAT I DON'T DIE FROM THE AIR POLLUTION BEFORE I CAN EVEN GET HOME???</p>	
<p>3rd set of traffic lights close by on a relatively quiet road - necessary?</p> <p>pls consider adding bike parking rails , especially on added pavement areas</p>	

<p>Traffic lights slow down vehicular movement and create pollution with adverse impact on air quality.</p> <p>And cyclists do not observe red lights making it dangerous to pedestrians who legitimately cross when the green man is shown .</p> <p>There will be no enforcement of anonymous cyclists who commit these offences.</p>	
<p>The amount of traffic signals seems excessive. Stationary gas vehicles will lead to worse air quality</p>	
<p>Cycle lane not necessary. The road is wide enough for safe cycling and cars.</p> <p>Disagree with removal of roundabouts. Many cars drive very fast around redriff road and the roundabout forces them to slow down. As a pedestrian with young children I am always relieved when cars and motorbikes that are speeding slow down at that point.</p>	
<p>Disagree with the introduction of traffic signals. Unnecessary and will slow down and interrupt movement. Disagree with tree removal.</p>	
<p>Additional set of traffic lights unnecessary</p>	
<p>I disagree with replacing the mini-roundabouts with traffic lights.</p>	

<p>The existing roundabout facilitates smooth traffic flow, I don't believe traffic lights are required at this junction.</p> <p>I oppose the removal of mature trees.</p>	
<p>I oppose bus stop removal. I also oppose removal of mini roundabout as this will lead to increased travel times and frustration, given the number of traffic lights in the plan and in an area of too few cyclists.</p> <p>No parking provisions next to supermarket (Nisa).</p>	
<p>As before. The roundabouts work for a freer flow of traffic which benefits those who live here. Traffic lights are a bad idea.</p> <p>(Why a cycle lane? Even if a bridge were to be built (which is the whole idea of the route) the cycle route should be around the docks to lower rd and across the woodlands to Jamaica rd, not up the side of Redriff Rd.</p> <p>Where are the benefits in this whole plan to; a local residents, b. Pedestrians, c. bus users. d car drivers?)</p>	

<p>I strongly oppose the removal of the roundabout. This is not a busy junction and does not need to be signalised. It will simply cause needless delay.</p> <p>I also strongly oppose the kerb on the segregated cycleway. This will make crossing the road with a pram very difficult.</p>	
<p>Strongly opposing the removal of the mini roundabout. Adding traffic lights here does not make sense and will create more pollution. This is a low traffic area, traffic lights will make cars and motorbikes wait for no reason. Cycling traffic here is also non-existent so this will be a waste of money.</p>	
<p>I see no need for traffic lights at Quebec Way, which even with a new completed development is an incredibly quiet street. Traffic lights will also increase noise pollution near South Dock. The dock area generally has low-noise, to its benefit.</p>	
<p>Introduction of traffic lights at a location where traffic is always light and handled well by the existing mini-roundabout.</p>	
<p>Better to have traffic lights than roundabout.</p>	

<p>The road narrowing along this stretch will cause issues when two large vehicles such as buses meet in opposite directions.</p> <p>However, I have no opposition to the removal of the Quebec Way roundabout and the replacement with traffic signals.</p>	
<p>Strongly support the new junction and increased pavement.</p> <p>What's the need to remove the two trees?</p>	
<p>Fully support all the conversions to roundabouts. This will hugely improve cyclist safety. Currently motor traffic speeds around the roundabouts dangerously because of their wide lanes.</p>	
<p>These changes Segregated two-way cycleway on the east side of Redriff Road</p> <p>Access to and from Quebec Way via signal controlled junction</p> <p>Advance stop line on Quebec Way make its safer for cyclists.</p>	

<p>The early release for cycles from Quebec Way should begin at the start of Phase 2 of the staging diagram, as there would be no need for cycles to be held at red during this phase, only motor traffic. An example of this can be found at the Buckingham Gate/Birdcage Walk junction that was implemented as part of CS3, where eastbound cycles get an early release during the phase for westbound cycles.</p>	<p>The operation of the traffic signals will be discussed and agreed with TfL. We will aim to install the latest technologies that give us the optimum performance for all road users</p>
<p>If cyclist could proceed when safe to do so this would be acceptable. Otherwise it just delays cyclist and the safety benefits do not outweigh this. I cannot imagine there are many recordings of cyclist incidents. This data has not been provided.</p>	

Have you thought about changing the roundabout to a Dutch-style one that gives priority to cyclists? Otherwise I broadly support this section.

However as in my answer to section 15, I guess it depends on volume of pedestrians, but surely you could have separate pedestrian crossings going over the Cycleway and the road? As I mentioned on the Cycleway on Embankment this allows cyclists to flow easily all the way along the road.

I like the painted cycle tracks leading to and from Quebec Way from the Cycleway.

(I like the segregated cycleway but I am concerned by the two pedestrian crossings that cut across it. Could it not be like the Cycleway on the Embankment where there is a separate crossing for the cycleway and for the roads? In practice pedestrians can safely cross the Cycleway there without pressing the crossing button in most cases, preventing the cyclists from having to stop. They can then use the pedestrian crossing which stops the traffic on the road, thus prioritising cycle and pedestrians over motorised vehicles.

Also surely it is possible to plant another small tree so at least there is no net loss? This is the kind of thing environmentalists would kick off about. If you planted two more small trees then you could sell it as 'a net gain' of trees.)

Traffic signals were the preferred option that allowed a design that catered for all road users

<p>Ideally the signalised crossing on Quebec Way would be closer to the Redriff Road desire line.</p>	<p>There insufficient road space to allow pedestrians to cross in two stages, furthermore cyclists are only held on a red light when the pedestrian phase is activated, so this is the only time cyclists are held up.</p>
---	--

Improved public transport (reliability, more & direct routes, accessibility, overcrowding)	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Pavement should not be narrowed. They are already not that wide. I see more people wearing with buggies than cyclists. Bus stop should not be removed nor trees.</p>	<p>The bus stop is not being removed in this section, the northbound stop is being slightly relocated</p>
<p>I oppose bus stop removal. I also oppose removal of mini roundabout as this will lead to increased travel times and frustration, given the number of traffic lights in the plan and in an area of too few cyclists.</p> <p>No parking provisions next to supermarket (Nisa).</p>	
<p>The bus stop should be removed completely as there is a bus stop within a very short walking distance requiring the bus to turn into a bus stop bay. Retaining the bus stop will increase congestion and travel time unnecessarily.</p>	<p>This is an existing bus stop and is not considered to cause undue delays</p>

<p>A new westbound bus stop should be added to this section, maybe close to the eastbound stop, in order to replace the stop which is to be removed between Surrey Quays Road and Brunswick Quay. Otherwise the distances between the stops will be too large.</p>	<p>To provide a segregated cycle route, bus stops are designed to be on the main carriageway with the cycleway behind the bus stop. At this location this would not been possible, as we wanted to minimise the effect on the tress on the opposite side of the road.</p> <p>The diagram above shows the existing stops circled in red. The spacing between the bus stops will now be 520m, we have looked at trying to reduce this distance by moving these stops but this isn't feasible.</p> <p>Tfl have provided us with data showing the use of these stops</p>
---	--

Less congestion - Improved traffic flow	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Cycleway not required - Rotherhithe Bridge Project has been cancelled.</p> <p>Reduced road width will increase traffic congestion and cause delays in traffic movement along redriff road towards Tesco access road and Lower Road.</p> <p>Yellow lines not required, there is not a current problem.</p>	<p>The reduce road widths will not increase traffic congestion. The flows using Redriff Road are suitable for this road width</p>

More and safer cycle infrastructure/ routes	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Cycle Parking	
<p>Fantastic, but please may we add in cycle parking on the corner by the new nisa local. and as always if we could introduce more greenery the better!</p>	<p>Where space and demand permits cycle parking will be provided.</p>
<p>3rd set of traffic lights close by on a relatively quiet road - necessary?</p> <p>pls consider adding bike parking rails , especially on added pavement areas</p>	
<p>Lots of missed opportunities for planting.</p> <p>More trees.</p> <p>More hedging or suds planting. Even unmown grass.</p> <p>Wide swathes of paving are not necessary for pedestrians. Make it a more pleasant environment.</p> <p>Are there going to be sensibly placed bike racks along the way, where people may need to pop into shops etc</p>	

Support for cycle facilities	
The segregated cycling is great and essential to the whole scheme. It's the only way to make cyclists feel safe and increase participation.	
This stretch is not cyclist-friendly at present and full of speeding and rat-running motor vehicles.	
more cycleways please	
segregated cycle lanes are a must when cycling with young children	
Strongly support the enhancement for cyclists using Quebec Way to get to Alfred Salter School.	

More enforcement	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Traffic lights slow down vehicular movement and create pollution with adverse impact on air quality.</p> <p>And cyclists do not observe red lights making it dangerous to pedestrians who legitimately cross when the green man is shown .</p> <p>There will be no enforcement of anonymous cyclists who commit these offences.</p>	<p>Enforcement is the responsibility of the Metropolitan Police who have a dedicated team who are tasked with focusing on cyclists</p>

No controlled parking

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Leave trees where they are, I don't believe trees will be replaced (they are only proposed no guarantee).</p> <p>Double yellow lines will hinder deliveries and those with vehicles.</p>	<p>Deliveries can be load and unload on yellow lines for up to 40 mins as long as it is safe to do so.</p> <p>We also offer visitors permits and pay by phone bays.</p> <p>Residents still have visits from tradespersons in our other zones and we rarely receive complaints about it.</p>
<p>I oppose bus stop removal. I also oppose removal of mini roundabout as this will lead to increased travel times and frustration, given the number of traffic lights in the plan and in an area of too few cyclists.</p> <p>No parking provisions next to supermarket (Nisa).</p>	
<p>Cycleway not required - Rotherhithe Bridge Project has been cancelled.</p> <p>Reduced road width will increase traffic congestion and cause delays in traffic movement along redriff road towards Tesco access road and Lower Road.</p> <p>Yellow lines not required, there is not a current problem.</p>	<p>Controlled parking zones (CPZs) are the most effective way that the council can manage kerbside space. If all new developments had enough parking for all residents, traffic in the area would increase as would air pollution. Southwark Council's Movement Plan encourages more sustainable modes of travel.</p>

Noise Reduction	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
I see no need for traffic lights at Quebec Way, which even with a new completed development is an incredibly quiet street. Traffic lights will also increase noise pollution near South Dock. The dock area generally has low-noise, to its benefit. .	There is no reason to suggest there will be an increase in noise from the junction operating as a traffic signal controlled as opposed to the existing layout as a roundabout

Other	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
The speeding and revving of loud engines also happens down Quebec Way, most annoyingly in the evenings or weekends, sometimes very late at night. Teens on scooters treat it as a race track some times.	
No complaints at all.	
I support in principle and I know these comments won't actually matter but I'll give them anyway. This is, again, a very engineered way of controlling traffic. I'm sure with 15000 new residents its necessary but what's with all the hard surfaces? What about rain water run-off? Why are you not incorporating sustainable drainage at the same time?? We're in a climate emergency - come on people! I know there are a lot of talented people at TfL and LBS - you can do better than this. Be more aspirational!	Sustainable drainage will be provided at the locations that we are able to provide
Let's have as few curbs as possible. Use tactile paving instead of curbs to demarcate the border between the	Bevelled kerbs will be used on this project

<p>road and the pavement. If you are going to put in curbs, then those curbs should be bevelled. Non-bevelled curbs are a extreme danger to cyclists. TfL has started bevelling the curbs on its cycle lanes. Please do the same. Thank you.</p>	
--	--

River crossings	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>No bridge no need for route.. WHITE ELEPHANT.</p>	<p>This proposal aims to link to existing and proposed routes in the area and provide a link to Cycleway 4. It will also provide a key local route to local facilities and destinations further afield. A ferry option is still being investigated should this be taken forward this proposal will complement the crossing</p>
<p>As before. The roundabouts work for a freer flow of traffic which benefits those who live here. Traffic lights are a bad idea.</p> <p>(Why a cycle lane? Even if a bridge were to be built (which is the whole idea of the route) the cycle route should be around the docks to lower rd and across the woodlands to Jamaica rd, not up the side of Redriff Rd.</p> <p>Where are the benefits in this whole plan to; a local residents, b. Pedestrians, c. bus users. d car drivers?)</p>	
<p>Cycleway not required - Rotherhithe Bridge Project has been cancelled.</p> <p>Reduced road width will increase traffic congestion and cause delays in traffic movement along redriff road towards Tesco access road and Lower Road.</p> <p>Yellow lines not required, there is not a current problem.</p>	

Safer speeds	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
There is no traffic on this road and this road is already narrow. If you have money to throw around, put a speed camera on the stretch of road between the Redriff Road/Quebec Way roundabout and Salter Road.	The provision of safety cameras is the responsibility of the police. We will discuss with them the appropriateness of cameras
This stretch is not cyclist-friendly at present and full of speeding and rat-running motor vehicles.	
<p>Cycle lane not necessary. The road is wide enough for safe cycling and cars.</p> <p>Disagree with removal of roundabouts. Many cars drive very fast around redriff road and the roundabout forces them to slow down. As a pedestrian with young children I am always relieved when cars and motorbikes that are speeding slow down at that point.</p>	
The current speed of 20mph is sufficient, any slower more congestion and more road rage	There are no proposals to further reduce the speed limit. The proposals are aimed to encourage driver to drive at 20mph

Segregated space for walking, cycling & driving	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
I think its extremely important to segregate cycle lanes from the rest of traffic. I have been commuting by bicycle on this road for nearly ten years and I have lost count of the number of reckless impatient drivers (cars, vans, buses and taxis) that have nearly or actually knocked me off of my bicycle.	


Segregation between cyclist and pedestrians

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I think the camden kerb segregation over the bridge provides insufficient separation between cyclists and pedestrians. As the foot and cycle paths are at the same level, the design does not signal strongly enough to users of the paths that they are separated, not doing enough to discourage pedestrians from walking in the cycle path and, vice versa.</p>	<p>Improved footway will reinforce the difference between the footway and the cycleway and encourage both pedestrians and cyclist to use there area. There will be a change in footway material will provide clear visual distinction from cycleway.</p>

Wider and well-maintained pavements/walking routes

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Pavement should not be narrowed. They are already not that wide. I see more people wearing with buggies than cyclists. Bus stop should not be removed nor trees.</p>	<p>The footway width is being reduced on the eastside of Redriff Road. The footway on the west side is unaffected</p>

Section 17. Redriff Road (between Omega Gate to Ropemaker Road)



Better lighting

Comments and or suggestions

Response

where the existing bus stop is being removed at the entrance to Russia dock woodlands, would you consider installing a crossing, as this is a common place for families with young children to exit the woodlands by foot and bicycle travelling to and from Redriff, Alfred salter and St johns schools. it is not pleasant to walk along salter rd with children to a distant crossing due to fast and heavy traffic. this will encourage more families to walk and cycle to

<p>school. the existing underpass to Greenland dock is dark and feels unsafe in winter, I would not walk through the underpass unaccompanied in the dark due to local crime, so this is not a suitable alternative.</p>	
--	--

Clean and tidy

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>1. Traffic signals will significantly slow down local buses in the area, which are already very slow and it takes a long while to get to the nearest tube/overground stations. This adds a lot to overall commute time.</p> <p>2. Rotherhithe Street is very narrow and it's really struggling with 2 way traffic at peak times. A cycle track will only make the situation worse.</p> <p>3. The increased number of cyclists in the area will make it less safe for walking, especially for children and parents with a buggy, it will also increase the amount of garbage on the streets and will likely lead to the increased crime rate too.</p>	<p>It is not considered likely that the introduction of a cycle route will lead to a deterioration in the cleanliness or tidiness of the area</p>

Crossing roads is easy and safe	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Zebra Crossing location and adding tiger crossing	
<p>The new zebra crossing should be closer to the mouth of Onega Gate to allow local pedestrians to cross directly to the woodlands. The proposed location doesn't follow any obvious desire lines and leaves the woodland disconnected.</p>	<p>Being investigated and location will be confirmed during the detailed design stage.</p>
<p>I would suggest that the zebra crossing is closer to Onega Gate/Russia Dock woodland, as there are more people coming onto Redriff Road at this point and wanting to cross.</p>	
<p>This stretch is not cyclist-friendly at present and full of speeding and rat-running motor vehicles.</p>	
<p>I suggest to move:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - new pedestrian crossing (very needed indeed) closer to Onega Gate road and entrance of the park ie where current bus stop is - this is where pedestrian traffic concentrates now - moved bus stop can then come closer to the current one (more west) <p>Artist's impression 17b is wrong as the trees will be gone :(</p>	

I think the pedestrian crossing does not really serve anyone there. The desire line is for pedestrians (and indeed cyclists) wanting to cross out of Omega Gate into the woodland (NCN425). It's an important part of three school runs (Redriff, Alfred Salter and St John's primary schools) and a vital link for cyclists. I expect pedestrians will largely ignore the proposed crossing and continue to jaywalk as they are doing now - I see them every morning.

Also, I welcome new trees, but I'm not sure how that new tree near Omega Gate is going to fit. As StreetView (and the artist's impression) tells us, currently there is one massive manhole and a streetlamp there.

where the existing bus stop is being removed at the entrance to russia dock woodlands, would you consider installing a crossing, as this is a common place for families with young children to exit the woodlands by foot and bicycle travelling to and from redriff, alfred salter and st johns schools. it is not pleasant to walk along salter rd with children to a distant crossing due to fast and heavy traffic. this will encourage more families to walk and cycle to school. the existing underpass to greenland dock is dark and feels unsafe in winter, i would not walk through the underpass unaccompanied in the dark due to local crime, so this is not a suitable alternative.

Be nice to have good cycle access here to Russia woodland and Greenland Dock. Link to NR425 of high quality, plus a crossing. A crossing close to the bus stop would be useful for pedestrians and also allow cyclists on other side of road to safely access the link.

We suggest the addition of a Parallel Crossing (A Zebra that can be used by both those on foot and bicycle) at the location of the moved bus stop. This would provide a useful link into the existing National Cycle Route 425. If this is deemed too close to the Zebra crossing then this crossing should be upgraded to a Parallel Crossing and the short section of the path leading to it should be marked as a shared path for people on bicycles and people on foot.

Please could we have a parallel crossing (a zebra for people on bike and foot) at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425.

Also, let's have as few curbs as possible. Use tactile paving instead of curbs to demarcate the border between the road and the pavement. If you are going to put in curbs, then those curbs should be bevelled. Non-bevelled curbs are a extreme danger to cyclists. TfL has started bevelling the curbs on its cycle lanes. Please do the same.

Thank you.

<p>We suggest the addition of a Parallel Crossing (A Zebra that can be used by both those on foot and bicycle) at the location of the moved bus stop. This would provide a useful link into the existing National Cycle Route 425. If this is deemed too close to the Zebra crossing then this crossing should be upgraded to a Parallel Crossing and the short section of the path leading to it should be marked as a shared path for people on bicycles and people on foot.</p>	
<p>Can we have a parallel crossing at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425?</p>	
<p>A cycle-pedestrian crossing should be provided at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425.</p>	
<p>Can we have a parallel crossing at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425?</p>	
<p>A zebra crossing to connect to NCN 425 would be useful.</p>	
<p>Support for crossing</p>	
<p>Particularly good to see a new zebra crossing here. The current road design makes it unnecessarily hard for humans to cross this road.</p>	
<p>Reduced traffic speed, new zebra crossings are a great feature in this section.</p>	

<p>How many cyclists are there to justify this road?</p> <p>I agree with the double yellow lines and the zebra crossing.</p>	<p>The current estimates suggest that up to 150 cyclists will use this route if a Ferry crossing is provided. In addition the provision of the cycleway opens up opportunities for people to cycle</p>
<p>1. Traffic signals will significantly slow down local buses in the area, which are already very slow and it takes a long while to get to the nearest tube/overground stations. This adds a lot to overall commute time.</p> <p>2. Rotherhithe Street is very narrow and it's really struggling with 2 way traffic at peak times. A cycle track will only make the situation worse.</p> <p>3. The increased number of cyclists in the area will make it less safe for walking, especially for children and parents with a buggy, it will also increase the amount of garbage on the streets and will likely lead to the increased crime rate too.</p>	<p>There is no reason why a cycleway should make the road less safe for pedestrians. The road width is generally being reduced, which will slow vehicle speeds and thereby lower the risk to pedestrians. In addition the proposal overall provide additional controlled crossings</p>
<p>I strongly oppose the kerb on the segregated cycleway. This will make crossing the road with a pram very difficult.</p> <p>I also oppose the relocation of the bus stop. This is presently at a very convenient location for the park, pub and access to Onega Gate and Finland Street. The new location makes no sense whatsoever.</p>	<p>New crossings have been proposed at regular intervals to allow pedestrians to cross Redriff Road and Salter Road</p>

Do not agree with traffic calming/reduction and cycle lanes

Comments and or suggestions	Response
Meaningless cycle lane in a single street road	The provision of safer cycling facilities is a priority for the Council. This proposal allows us to link existing and proposed cycle routes. These proposals will give people the opportunity to cycle local journeys as well journeys further afield
No need for a separated two way cycle track (and I am a cyclist and use the road every day). The road is already safe with very limited traffic and speed is limited at 20mph. You would better ensure the speed limit is respected. DO NOT CUT TREES or if you do plant more than you cut !	
No need to lose grass verges and trees for cyclists' safety. Instead, this is the perfect place for a speed camera, given that this is the stretch of road that people like to speed	

1. Traffic signals will significantly slow down local buses in the area, which are already very slow and it takes a long while to get to the nearest tube/overground stations. This adds a lot to overall commute time.

2. Rotherhithe Street is very narrow and it's really struggling with 2 way traffic at peak times. A cycle track will only make the situation worse.

3. The increased number of cyclists in the area will make it less safe for walking, especially for children and parents with a buggy, it will also increase the amount of garbage on the streets and will likely lead to the increased crime rate too.

These proposals are unfairly skewed in favour of bicyclists and impair bus travel efficiency.

Gently cycling as in Amsterdam is one thing ... the aggressive lycra clad 'tour de France' style of cycling is hostile, dangerous and inconsiderate to pedestrians.

Do not see the need for this cycle route, there is enough already within the Peninsular

The road layout seems to work well at the moment. I cannot see any real benefit to the changes. Redriff/Salter Road has good visibility with grass verges along most of its length making it already safe for pedestrians and cyclists. Also the road currently does not seem to have much traffic.

This road is already one of the most pleasant and safe in the area, I just do not think that this scheme justifies the cost.

These changes are completely unnecessary!!!

There is no need for a cycle lane!!!!

This would be a huge waste of money moving bus stops that are in good locations.

This will make the roadways much less safe for pedestrians. Cyclists seldom stop for zebra crossings or indeed red lights so this will be far more dangerous.

Crossing the road is fairly tricky at certain times of the day however, this proposal will not solve that problem at all.

<p>Removal of bus lay bys will mean that traffic will be stopped as there will be inadequate room for passing. This will cause traffic delays.</p> <p>Cycle lane and width restrictions not required as no one will use it - there will not be a Rotherhithe Bridge.</p> <p>Don't forget that the road speed in this area is already restricted to 20 mph.</p>	
<p>The cyclist could re-join the cycle lane from the under path. Also you are removing to many trees.</p> <p>As put before a lot of the cyclists don't cycle along Redriff road. They use the under path to Greenland dock and cycle along Brunswick Quay to the top the and they can join Rotherhithe Street from the top of the dock!</p>	
<p>There should be no reduction in motor vehicle carriageway width as a result of introducing a cycle track.</p> <p>There should be no loss of trees.</p> <p>There should be no loss of grass verges.</p> <p>There should be no loss of bus lay-bys</p>	

Easy and safe to cycle	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
General Support	
This is very good. Much safer for using bikes!	
Segregated cycling is absolutely necessary here.	
more cycleways please	
that's a lot of trees to lose, although segregated cycle lane is important.	
Cycle lane have had more impact on people since introduced	
segregated cycle lanes are essential when cycling with young children	
I think its extremely important to segregate cycle lanes from the rest of traffic. I have been commuting by bicycle on this road for nearly ten years and I have lost count of the number of reckless impatient drivers (cars, vans, buses and taxis) that have nearly or actually knocked me off of my bicycle.	

<p>While I do not love the loss of trees this is essential infrastructure for when the Rotherhithe Bridge eventually (I hope) gets built, and links up with the rest of the cycle network. The loss of trees and the verge will annoy some locals so perhaps again you could plant some small trees so there is no net loss?</p>	
<p>Connection to NCR 425</p>	
<p>Fantastic, the possible connection to NCN425 would be strongly supported.</p>	<p>Sustrans are currently reviewing their routes in London, NCR 425 also effects Lower Road proposals, until it clear what alignment this route may take a connection at this stage is not considered appropriate. The NCR meets Quietway 14 in Russia Dock Woodlands so access and egress is still possible</p>
<p>Good. I think connection with NCN425 makes a lot of sense, though slightly tricky to see how cyclists would access it from the segregated lanes... perhaps they could make use of the zebra crossing somehow, or perhaps even the connection to NCN425 could actually occur on the other side of the bridge, winding around on the greenland dock side through the park and then under the underpass?</p>	
<p>Please connect with NCN 425!</p>	
<p>love the connection to the NCN 425</p>	
<p>A connection with NCN 425 would be very useful.</p>	
<p>Connecting to National Cycle Route 425 is a big plus and having a segregated lane will make it a lot safer</p>	
<p>Junction with Omega Gate</p>	

<p>Risk of vehicles turning into Onega Gate colliding with people on bikes. The turning radius is not tight enough meaning that drivers can't see cyclists approaching from 'behind' them as they turn. Either the turning radius needs to be tighter by extending the protective kerb nearer the junction or setting the cycleway further back from Redriff Road so that drivers approach the cycleway at 90 degree angle.</p>	<p>The design of the minor junctions (Onega Gate) where they meet\ cross the Cycleway, is governed by the availability of road space. The designs have incorporated raised surfaces, small radius at the junction and continuation of the segregation as close to the junction as possible. At the detailed design stage this will be checked again.</p> <p>Once works commence a public awareness programme will take place, explaining to local residents how these junction layout should used</p>
<p>These changes Segregated two-way cycleway on the east side of Redriff Road</p> <p>Connection proposed to NCN 425</p> <p>Cycle priority provided across Onega Gate through raised junction to reduce the speed of turning traffic will make it safer.</p>	
<p>Combined crossing for Pedestrians and Cyclist</p>	
<p>Strongly support and suggest a parallel crossing (a zebra for people on bike and foot) at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425</p>	
<p>Please add a cycle/pedestrian crossing at the location of the moved bus stop, to connect to Sustrans National Cycle Route 425</p>	
<p>A zebra crossing to connect to NCN 425 would be useful.</p>	

<p>need for a parallel crossing (a zebra for people on bike and foot) at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425.</p>	
<p>Please install a parallel cycle crossing at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425.</p>	
<p>I would like a parallel crossing (a zebra for people on bike and foot) at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425.</p>	
<p>please provide a parallel crossing (a zebra for people on bike and foot) at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425</p>	
<p>I would suggest adding a a zebra crossing for cyclists and pedestrians where the bus stop is moved to so that it links into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425</p>	
<p>Would be great to have parallel crossing (a zebra for people on bike and foot) at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425</p>	
<p>parallel crossing (a zebra for people on bike and foot) at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425.</p>	
<p>a parallel crossing (a zebra for people on bike and foot) at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425.</p>	

<p>The zebra crossing should have a parallel cycle crossing as well.</p>	
<p>Be nice to have good cycle access here to Russia woodland and Greenland Dock. Link to NR425 of high quality, plus a crossing. A crossing close to the bus stop would be useful for pedestrians and also allow cyclists on other side of road to safely access the link.</p>	
<p>Provision of suitable crossing to connect safely with NCN425.</p>	
<p>a parallel crossing (a zebra for people on bike and foot) at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425.</p>	
<p>We suggest the addition of a Parallel Crossing (A Zebra that can be used by both those on foot and bicycle) at the location of the moved bus stop. This would provide a useful link into the existing National Cycle Route 425. If this is deemed too close to the Zebra crossing then this crossing should be upgraded to a Parallel Crossing and the short section of the path leading to it should be marked as a shared path for people on bicycles and people on foot.</p>	

<p>Please could we have a parallel crossing (a zebra for people on bike and foot) at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425.</p> <p>Also, let's have as few curbs as possible. Use tactile paving instead of curbs to demarcate the border between the road and the pavement. If you are going to put in curbs, then those curbs should be bevelled. Non-bevelled curbs are a extreme danger to cyclists. TfL has started bevelling the curbs on its cycle lanes. Please do the same.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
<p>We suggest the addition of a Parallel Crossing (A Zebra that can be used by both those on foot and bicycle) at the location of the moved bus stop. This would provide a useful link into the existing National Cycle Route 425. If this is deemed too close to the Zebra crossing then this crossing should be upgraded to a Parallel Crossing and the short section of the path leading to it should be marked as a shared path for people on bicycles and people on foot.</p>	
<p>A cycle-pedestrian crossing should be provided at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425.</p>	
<p>Can we have a parallel crossing at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425?</p>	

<p>I think the camden kerb segregation over the bridge provides insufficient separation between cyclists and pedestrians. As the foot and cycle paths are at the same level, the design does not signal strongly enough to users of the paths that they are separated, not doing enough to discourage pedestrians from walking in the cycle path and, vice versa.</p>	<p>Improved footway will reinforce the difference between the footway and the cycleway and encourage both pedestrians and cyclist to use there area. There will be a change in footway material will provide clear visual distinction from cycleway</p>
---	---

Enjoyable environment

Comments and or suggestions

Response



It is a real shame to lose so many trees in areas where there is significant pollution. Can new trees be planted elsewhere to compensate?

Six trees are effected within this section and two new location s for a tree has been identified. The designs developed to date we have taken great care to minimise the loss of trees.

Would be better to create an even more meaningful separation between the cycle lane and the road through planting or similar. Traffic speed cameras to restrict vehicle speeds.	At the next design stage we will continue this and investigate opportunities to plant additional trees
Loss of 5 trees and grass verges is not great	
No need for a separated two way cycle track (and I am a cyclist and use the road every day). The road is already safe with very limited traffic and speed is limited at 20mph. You would better ensure the speed limit is respected. DO NOT CUT TREES or if you do plant more than you cut !	
More trees & green verges removed to enable a few people to cycle? Completely selfish scheme!	
If you are removing 6 trees, you should plant 6 trees, WE NEED MORE TREES!!!	
I don't understand how removing trees is good for the environment.	
Do not support the removal of trees.	
Re plant trees here	
space should be take from the car space, not from the green	
I oppose unless the greenery / trees are replaced like for like, if not more of it. Certainly not less!	

<p>The loss of trees could be partially compensated by installing new ones on the new pedestrian spaces (e.g. either side of the junction, next to the bus stop)</p>	
<p>I oppose the removal of the green space and trees along the southbound side of Redriff Road. The green verges along this stretch of road are one of the key features that make living in Rotherhithe and Surrey Quays unique and feel much more a community than other areas of Southwark. This removal will remove much of the green space in the area and cause much more visual pollution, as well as increased danger for pedestrians by removing the buffer between them and traffic.</p>	
<p>More trees not less. If 15 are being felled 9 is not a replacement. Should be 45.</p>	
<p>I support all the changes, though loss of greenery is sad (although I understand why it would be needed).</p>	
<p>Strongly support despite loss of trees. Support narrowing of junction with Omega Gate - this will slow vehicles hugely compared to current layout.</p>	
<p>why, following the removal of 5 trees, only one is planted?</p>	
<p>If six trees will be lost the council should replant at least 12 trees to</p>	
<p>Compensate for the loss of mature trees. All</p>	

proposals diminish the number of trees in the area which goes against london targets to reduce air pollution and urban heath island effect. I though we should be creating greens specs in line with london being declared a national park city and not removing them.

The loss of 6 trees and extensive grass verges is disgusting given the the need locally and globally to protect and enhance our natural environment. The council should be ashamed of this.

You are providing no information regarding the replacement landscape scheme. The Rotherhithe peninsular is a quiet, green, sub-urban space and what you are proposing is removing this green and leafy character, replacing it with more tarmac and urbanisation.

I oppose the changes because it means the loss of a significant green verge and many trees. I know the plan notes that there will be a net gain in trees, but these will be in different locations to those that will be removed. This will change the quality of the street and walking environment. More trees, planting and landscaping should be provided to mitigate the proposed loss, not elsewhere but in the same locations and proximity to the loss.

While I do not love the loss of trees this is essential infrastructure for when the Rotherhithe Bridge eventually (I hope) gets built, and links up with the rest of the cycle network. The loss of trees and the verge will annoy some locals so perhaps again you could plant some small trees so there is no net loss?	
The loss of trees will make the road less attractive and warmer for a long section without any shelter.	
Greenery is essential. Removal of so many trees and the road verge need to be compensated for.	
You should replace the 6 trees with at least 4	
If cyclist could proceed when safe to do so this would be acceptable. Otherwise it just delays cyclist and the safety benefits do not outweigh this. I cannot imagine there are many recordings of cyclist incidents. This data has not been provided.	
Loss of trees	
There is a removal of a large number of trees and grass verge along with the bus lay-bys. this seems to reduce both the safety and the pleasant environment of the street.	
Grass and trees should not be removed, green spaces and trees are needed in the area with so many large apartment blocks being built.	
Strongly disagree with the latest as of grass verges for this use. Verges are important for the sense of	

<p>space, wellbeing, water absorption and for the aesthetic of our area. No more hard surfaces needed.</p> <p>Disagree with loss of trees. Red riff road and salter road are lined with trees it contributes to why we like being here and to the well-being off all of us.</p>	
<p>The removal of 6 trees and replacement with 1 is unacceptable, and I cannot support it.</p>	
<p>Strongly oppose the removal of 6 mature trees. Otherwise support.</p>	
<p>I oppose cycle priority across side road. Loss of trees will lead to loss of aesthetic appeal of one of the most beautiful sections of Redriff Road.</p>	
<p>that's a lot of trees to lose, although segregated cycle lane is important.</p>	
<p>But would be a shame to loose so many trees.</p>	
<p>This is all looking great, however, I am struggling to understand the loss of trees?</p>	
<p>with minimal loss of green space</p>	
<p>Please plant extra replacement trees as close as possible</p>	
<p>Loss of many trees. The general proposal is not clear on how these trees are replaced. There are in general too many proposed new crossings and traffic lights on Redriff Road.</p>	

Find a way to add back the trees that will be cut down.	
Please replace all trees that would be lost	
<p>The cyclist could re-join the cycle lane from the under path. Also you are removing to many trees.</p> <p>As put before alot of the cyclists don't cycle along Redriff road. They use the under path to Greenland dock and cycle along Brunswick Quay to the top the and they can join Rotherhithe Street from the top of the dock!</p>	
<p>There should be no reduction in motor vehicle carriageway width as a result of introducing a cycle track.</p> <p>There should be no loss of trees.</p> <p>There should be no loss of grass verges.</p> <p>There should be no loss of bus lay-bys</p>	
Loss of trees with only one mitigating replacement.	

Improved junctions and/or traffic lights designs and phasing

Comments and or suggestions	Response
Onega Gate	
<p>Risk of vehicles turning into Onega Gate colliding with people on bikes. The turning radius is not tight enough meaning that drivers can't see cyclists approaching from 'behind' them as they turn. Either the turning radius needs to be tighter by extending the protective kerb nearer the junction or setting the cycleway further back from Redriff Road so that drivers approach the cycleway at 90 degree angle.</p>	<p>The design of the minor junctions (Onega Gate) where they meet\ cross the Cycleway, is governed by the availability of road space. The designs have incorporated raised surfaces, small radius at the junction and continuation of the segregation as close to the junction as possible. At the detailed design stage this will be checked again.</p> <p>Once works commence a public awareness programme will take place, explaining to local residents how these junction layout should used</p>
<p>Strongly support despite loss of trees. Support narrowing of junction with Onega Gate - this will slow vehicles hugely compared to current layout.</p>	
<p>These changes Segregated two-way cycleway on the east side of Redriff Road</p> <p>Connection proposed to NCN 425</p> <p>Cycle priority provided across Onega Gate through raised junction to reduce the speed of turning traffic will make it safer.</p>	
<p>I oppose cycle priority across side road. Loss of trees will lead to loss of aesthetic appeal of one of</p>	
<p>A cyclist having priority across a side road is no different than the existing road layout, vehicles</p>	

the most beautiful sections of Redriff Road.	turning in or out of Omega Gate, would be expected to give way to cyclists on Redriff Road. The only difference it that the cycleway has two way flow.
--	--

Improved public transport (reliability, more & direct routes, accessibility, overcrowding)	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Removal of bus lay-bys	
Very concerned about the loss of bus lay-bys and plan should be reworked to retain them even if this means losing some more green space. There is parkland around so this is not a significant loss	There is not sufficient space to accommodate bus lay-bys, as a result of them being removed bus services are not expected to deteriorate, more likely they will not be delayed as they will be in the carriageway and not reliant on drivers allowing them to leave the lay-bys
There is a removal of a large number of trees and grass verge along with the bus lay-bys. this seems to reduce both the safety and the pleasant environment of the street.	
Removal of bus lay bys will mean that traffic will be stopped as there will be inadequate room for passing. This will cause traffic delays.	
Cycle lane and width restrictions not required as no one will use it - there will not be a Rotherhithe Bridge.	
Don't forget that the road speed in this area is already restricted to 20 mph.	
There should be no reduction in motor vehicle	

<p>carriageway width as a result of introducing a cycle track.</p> <p>There should be no loss of trees.</p> <p>There should be no loss of grass verges.</p> <p>There should be no loss of bus lay-bys</p>	
<p>Bus journey times</p>	
<p>Again it is irresponsible of a council to try to encourage cyclists onto a major thoroughfare alongside the vehicles most likely to kill them .</p> <p>It would be far more sensible and popular to create well lit routes along the river , through parks and down quieter roads without buses .</p> <p>If buses are slowed down further then they already are you are more likely to push people to cars and mini cabs than to cycling . You gave a significant elderly population and seem intent on sacrificing their bus travel for the sake of younger cyclists .</p> <p>Inevitably where cycling routes have reduced road space for vehicles , buses have slowed down and eventually TFL reduce or remove routes . This is doing a disservice to bus users .</p>	<p>As above bus journey times are not expected to deteriorate as bus will be able to move more easily from bus stops, any delays as a result of the traffic signals are not expected to be significant. The cycleway does not effect the capacity of the existing traffic that uses Salter Road and Redriff Road</p>

The 53 route has been reduced. The 45 route been taken out of Blackfriars road . Many other routes serving Southwark have been reduced recently , often because the effect of cycle routes makes the traffic slower and makes it harder to predict journey times .

I am vehemently opposed to any more cycle routes on bus routes

1. **Traffic signals will significantly slow down local buses in the area**, which are already very slow and it takes a long while to get to the nearest tube/overground stations. This adds a lot to overall commute time.

2. Rotherhithe Street is very narrow and it's really struggling with 2 way traffic at peak times. A cycle track will only make the situation worse.

3. The increased number of cyclists in the area will make it less safe for walking, especially for children and parents with a buggy, it will also increase the amount of garbage on the streets and will likely lead to the increased crime rate too.

Ooops. Even if I am still alive after the three sets of traffic lights, I shall now have to contend with an unnecessary zebra crossing as well. **Will the buses ever be able to move, or are they being discontinued?**

<p>These proposals are unfairly skewed in favour of bicyclists and impair bus travel efficiency.</p> <p>Gently cycling as in Amsterdam is one thing ... the aggressive lycra clad 'tour de France' style of cycling is hostile, dangerous and inconsiderate to pedestrians.</p>	
<p>I suggest to move:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - new pedestrian crossing (very needed indeed) closer to Omega Gate road and entrance of the park ie where current bus stop is - this is where pedestrian traffic concentrates now - moved bus stop can then come closer to the current one (more west) <p>Artist's impression 17b is wrong as the trees will be gone :(</p>	
<p>I'm not sure the changes of the bus stop changes make sense. Whilst moving the bus stop to accommodate the cycle line makes sense. It doesn't make sense to relocate the other side, which is currently in a bay allowing cars to overtake whilst the bus stops - helping the flow of traffic. Moving the bus stop further down, preventing cars continuing they journey. As proposed, this route would be a nightmare for cars getting caught behind one of the regular buses.</p>	

<p>Removal of bus lanes will cause congestion on a road that is currently not congested creating pollution. Narrower pavement is not desirable for pedestrians especially those with buggies.</p>	<p>There are no bus lanes on Redriff Road or Salter Road</p>
<p>I strongly oppose the kerb on the segregated cycleway. This will make crossing the road with a pram very difficult.</p> <p>I also oppose the relocation of the bus stop. This is presently at a very convenient location for the park, pub and access to Onega Gate and Finland Street. The new location makes no sense whatsoever.</p>	

Less congestion - Improved traffic flow	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I'm not sure the changes of the bus stop changes make sense. Whilst moving the bus stop to accommodate the cycle line makes sense. It doesn't make sense to relocate the other side, which is currently in a bay allowing cars to overtake whilst the bus stops - helping the flow of traffic.</p> <p>Moving the bus stop further down, preventing cars continuing they journey. As proposed, this route would be a nightmare for cars getting caught behind one of the regular buses.</p>	<p>The proposed bus stop layout is common to the vast majority of stops in Southwark\London. The bus stopping in the carriageway allows the bus to move once all passengers have boarded or alighted, without causing any undue delay to other road users.</p>

More and safer cycle infrastructure/ routes

Comments and or suggestions	Response
Connection to NCR 425	
Fantastic, the possible connection to NCN425 would be strongly supported.	
Good. I think connection with NCN425 makes a lot of sense, though slightly tricky to see how cyclists would access it from the segregated lanes... perhaps they could make use of the zebra crossing somehow, or perhaps even the connection to NCN425 could actually occur on the other side of the bridge, winding around on the greenland dock side through the park and then under the underpass?	
Please connect with NCN 425!	
love the connection to the NCN 425	
A connection with NCN 425 would be very useful.	
These changes Segregated two-way cycleway on the east side of Redriff Road Connection proposed to NCN 425	
Cycle priority provided across Omega Gate through raised junction to reduce the speed of turning traffic will make it safer.	

Connecting to National Cycle Route 425 is a big plus and having a segregated lane will make it a lot safer	
General comments of support for segregated cycleway	
Segregated cycling is absolutely necessary here.	
While I do not love the loss of trees this is essential infrastructure for when the Rotherhithe Bridge eventually (I hope) gets built, and links up with the rest of the cycle network. The loss of trees and the verge will annoy some locals so perhaps again you could plant some small trees so there is no net loss?	
more cycleways please	
that's a lot of trees to lose, although segregated cycle lane is important.	
segregated cycle lanes are essential when cycling with young children	
I think its extremely important to segregate cycle lanes from the rest of traffic. I have been commuting by bicycle on this road for nearly ten years and I have lost count of the number of reckless impatient drivers (cars, vans, buses and taxis) that have nearly or actually knocked me off of my bicycle.	
Combined cycle and pedestrian crossing	
Strongly support and suggest a parallel crossing (a zebra for people on bike and foot) at the location of	

the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425	
Please add a cycle/pedestrian crossing at the location of the moved bus stop, to connect to Sustrans National Cycle Route 425	
A zebra crossing to connect to NCN 425 would be useful.	
need for a parallel crossing (a zebra for people on bike and foot) at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425.	
Please install a parallel cycle crossing at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425.	
I would like a parallel crossing (a zebra for people on bike and foot) at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425.	
please provide a parallel crossing (a zebra for people on bike and foot) at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425	
I would suggest adding a a zebra crossing for cyclists and pedestrians where the bus stop is moved to so that it links into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425	
Would be great to have parallel crossing (a zebra for people on bike and foot) at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425	

parallel crossing (a zebra for people on bike and foot) at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425.	
a parallel crossing (a zebra for people on bike and foot) at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425.	
The zebra crossing should have a parallel cycle crossing as well.	
Be nice to have good cycle access here to Russia woodland and Greenland Dock. Link to NR425 of high quality, plus a crossing. A crossing close to the bus stop would be useful for pedestrians and also allow cyclists on other side of road to safely access the link.	
Provision of suitable crossing to connect safely with NCN425.	
a parallel crossing (a zebra for people on bike and foot) at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425.	
We suggest the addition of a Parallel Crossing (A Zebra that can be used by both those on foot and bicycle) at the location of the moved bus stop. This would provide a useful link into the existing National Cycle Route 425. If this is deemed too close to the Zebra crossing then this crossing should be upgraded to a Parallel Crossing and the short section of the path leading to it should be marked as a shared path for people on bicycles and people	

<p>on foot.</p>	
<p>We suggest the addition of a Parallel Crossing (A Zebra that can be used by both those on foot and bicycle) at the location of the moved bus stop. This would provide a useful link into the existing National Cycle Route 425. If this is deemed too close to the Zebra crossing then this crossing should be upgraded to a Parallel Crossing and the short section of the path leading to it should be marked as a shared path for people on bicycles and people on foot.</p>	
<p>Can we have a parallel crossing at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425?</p>	
<p>A cycle-pedestrian crossing should be provided at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425.</p>	
<p>Please could we have a parallel crossing (a zebra for people on bike and foot) at the location of the moved bus stop to link into Sustrans National Cycle Route 425.</p> <p>Also, let's have as few curbs as possible. Use tactile paving instead of curbs to demarcate the border between the road and the pavement. If you are going to put in curbs, then those curbs should be bevelled. Non-bevelled curbs are a extreme danger to cyclists. TfL has started bevelling the curbs on its cycle lanes. Please do the same.</p>	

Thank you.

Other

Comments and or suggestions

Response

Again it is irresponsible of a council to try to encourage cyclists onto a major thoroughfare alongside the vehicles most likely to kill them .

It would be far more sensible and popular to create well lit routes along the river , through parks and down quieter roads without buses .

If buses are slowed down further then they already are you are more likely to push people to cars and mini cabs than to cycling . You gave a significant elderly population and seem intent on sacrificing their bus travel for the sake of younger cyclists .

Inevitably where cycling routes have reduced road space for vehicles , buses have slowed down and eventually TFL reduce or remove routes . This is doing a disservice to bus users .

The 53 route has been reduced . The 45 route been taken out of blackfriars road . Many other routes serving Southwark have been reduced recently , often because the effect of cycle routes makes the traffic slower and makes it harder to predict journey

The cycleway along this section is segregated from the carriageway, so the risk to cyclists is greatly reduced

times . I am vehemently opposed to any more cycle routes on bus routes	
Oooops. Even if I am still alive after the three sets of traffic lights, I shall now have to contend with an unnecessary zebra crossing as well. Will the buses ever be able to move, or are they being discontinued?	
Loss of many trees. The general proposal is not clear on how these trees are replaced. There are in general too many proposed new crossings and traffic lights on Redriff Road.	
Still looking very stark.	
I am opposing this out of principle that you are providing new zebra crossing on this road while taking away zebra crossings on other roads like Rotherhithe New Road / Rotherhithe Old Road that I use a lot. Why this different approach? I think it is very unfair and very bad.	The provision of crossing types is governed by a number of factors, in this case it is appropriate to provide a zebra crossing.

Reduced on street parking

Comments and or suggestions	Response
How many cyclists are there to justify this road? I agree with the double yellow lines and the zebra crossing.	

River crossings	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>No bridge no need for route.. WHITE ELEPHANT.</p> <p>Removal of bus lay bys will mean that traffic will be stopped as there will be inadequate room for passing. This will cause traffic delays.</p> <p>Cycle lane and width restrictions not required as no one will use it - there will not be a Rotherhithe Bridge.</p> <p>Don't forget that the road speed in this area is already restricted to 20 mph.</p>	<p>This proposal aims to link to existing and proposed routes in the area and provide a link to Cycleway 4. It will also provide a key local route to local facilities and destinations further afield. A ferry option is still being investigated should this be taken forward this proposal will complement the crossing</p>


Safer speeds	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Would be better to create an even more meaningful separation between the cycle lane and the road through planting or similar. Traffic speed cameras to restrict vehicle speeds.</p>	<p>Southwark to not have the powers to enforce speed limits, however our designs can influence drivers speeds. In this instance the narrowing of the carriageway width has been proved to reduce traffic speeds.</p> <p>We will be discussing with the police the future of the existing speed camera with a view to finding a suitable location.</p>
<p>No need to lose grass verges and trees for cyclists' safety. Instead, this is the perfect place for a speed camera, given that this is the stretch of road that people like to speed</p>	
<p>Reduced traffic speed, new zebra crossings are a</p>	

great feature in this section.	
--------------------------------	--

Segregated space for walking, cycling & driving	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
I think its extremely important to segregate cycle lanes from the rest of traffic. I have been commuting by bicycle on this road for nearly ten years and I have lost count of the number of reckless impatient drivers (cars, vans, buses and taxis) that have nearly or actually knocked me off of my bicycle.	
I think the camden kerb segregation over the bridge provides insufficient separation between cyclists and pedestrians. As the foot and cycle paths are at the same level, the design does not signal strongly enough to users of the paths that they are separated, not doing enough to discourage pedestrians from walking in the cycle path and, vice versa.	Improved footway will reinforce the difference between the footway and the cycleway and encourage both pedestrians and cyclist to use there area. There will be a change in footway material will provide clear visual distinction from cycleway.

Accessible for all	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Removal of bus lanes will cause congestion on a road that is currently not congested creating pollution. Narrower pavement is not desirable for pedestrians especially those with buggies.	To provide facilities for all we propose reduced width for all road users, motorist, cyclists and pedestrians. The narrowest widths are still within acceptable standards and have been kept to a minimum.

Section 18. Redriff Road (between Norway Gate and Quietway 14 connection)



Clean and tidy

Comments and or suggestions

1. Traffic signals will significantly slow down local buses in the area, which are already very slow and it takes a long while to get to the nearest tube/overground stations. This adds a lot to overall commute time.
2. Rotherhithe Street is very narrow and it's really struggling with 2 way traffic at peak times. A cycle track will only make the situation worse.
3. The increased number of cyclists in the area will

Response

It is not considered likely that the introduction of a cycle route will lead to a deterioration in the cleanliness or tidiness of the area

make it less safe for walking, especially for children and parents with a buggy, it will also increase the amount of garbage on the streets and will likely lead to the increased crime rate too.	
--	--

Crossing roads is easy and safe	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Pedestrian crossings are not close enough to the bus stop - people will still run across the road and will have issues with both the normal road and the bike lanes now.</p> <p>Where is the bus stop in the direction of Rotherhithe station going to be? Now seem very far apart</p>	<p>The bus stops will be on the exit side of the crossing and are positioned to be in the optimum position for bus user.</p> <p>Furthermore both bus stops are also served by paths to the pedestrian underpasses</p>
<p>The removal of the grass verges will make it much more dangerous for pedestrians along Redriff Road, as pedestrians will be increasingly likely to come into contact with cars. It also will cause more visual pollution as the green verges will be replaced with grey tarmac.</p>	<p>On the westside of Redriff Road vehicles and pedestrians will be closer together, on the eastside they will be further apart as the cycleway acts as a buffer. With reduced speeds the risk of vehicles leaving the carriageway will be reduced.</p>
<p>The non-signalized zebra crossings are great -- though I am not sure if drivers will actually follow the rules.</p>	
<p>Same comments apply</p> <p>(How many cyclists are there to justify this road?</p> <p>I agree with the double yellow lines and the zebra</p>	

crossing.)	
<p>I oppose cycle priority across side roads and cyclists using pedestrian path to Quietway 14.</p> <p>I oppose commingling cyclist crossing point with pedestrian zebra crossing. These two should be kept separate and a cyclist crossing should not have priority over cars driving on Salter Road / Redriff Road.</p>	<p>The cycle and pedestrian crossing are separated with each having their dedicated area to cross Salter Road</p>
<p>I also strongly oppose the kerb on the segregated cycleway. This will make crossing the road with a pram very difficult.</p>	<p>New crossing are proposed along the route to allow pedestrians to cross Redriff Road and Salter Road</p>

Do not agree with traffic calming/reduction and cycle lanes

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>No need for a separated two way cycle track (and I am a cyclist and use the road every day). The road is already safe with very limited traffic and speed is limited at 20mph. You would better ensure the speed limit is respected.</p> <p>DO NOT CUT TREES or if you do plant more than you cut !</p> <p>Do not remove grass verges.</p>	<p>The provision of safer cycling facilities is a priority for the Council. This proposal allows us to link existing and proposed cycle routes. These proposals will give people the opportunity to cycle local journeys as well journeys further afield.</p>
<p>Opposed to the segregated cycleway</p>	
<p>Do not see the need for this cycle route, there is</p>	

<p>enough already within the Peninsular</p>	
<p>The road layout seems to work well at the moment. I cannot see any real benefit to the changes. Redriff/Salter Road has good visibility with grass verges along most of its length making it already safe for pedestrians and cyclists. Also the road currently does not seem to have much traffic.</p> <p>Removing the grass verges would detract from what is currently one of the most pleasant and safe in the area, I just do not think that this scheme justifies the cost.</p>	
<p>Cycle lane is completely unnecessary</p> <p>Please do not remove speed cameras! There are people driving at outrageous speeds on this road everyday. Cyclists, cars and motorbikes alike have a blatant disregard for the 20mph limit. A cycle lane will encourage cyclists to go faster and so will the removal of speed cameras.</p>	
<p>Any thing about new cycle lane should be stopped</p>	
<p>Same comments apply</p> <p>(How many cyclists are there to justify this road? I agree with the double yellow lines and the zebra crossing.)</p>	
<p>Please refer to previous comments which equally apply.</p> <p>(Removal of bus lay bys will mean that traffic will be</p>	

<p>stopped as there will be inadequate room for passing. This will cause traffic delays.</p> <p>Cycle lane and width restrictions not required as no one will use it - there will not be a Rotherhithe Bridge.</p> <p>Don't forget that the road speed in this area is already restricted to 20 mph.)</p>	
<p>There should be no reduction in motor vehicle carriageway width as a result of introducing a cycle track.</p> <p>There should be no loss of grass verges.</p> <p>There should be no loss of bus lay-bys</p>	

Easy and safe to cycle	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
General support for cycleway	
<p>Segregated cycling is essential here to improve safety and reduce air pollution.</p>	
<p>I think its extremely important to segregate cycle lanes from the rest of traffic. I have been commuting by bicycle on this road for nearly ten years and I have lost count of the number of reckless impatient drivers (cars, vans, buses and taxis) that have nearly or actually knocked me off of my bicycle.</p>	

<p>This stretch is not cyclist-friendly at present and full of speeding and rat-running motor vehicles.</p>	
<p>Support for connection to Quietway 14</p>	
<p>Big fan of connecting with the Quietway</p>	
<p>There are some quite imaginative changes here and I like the connections to QW14. Fully support the cycleway having priority over the junctions and the joint pedestrian-Cycleway zebra crossing.</p>	
<p>Shame about the speed camera, it is working very well! (I live 100m from it)</p> <p>"New shared use pedestrian and cycle path connection to proposed Quietway 14": Lovely!</p>	
<p>I like the integration with the quietway. Quietways are a win-win for both cyclists and pedestrians. They should be signed much more prominently. I don't agree with the removal of the speed camera. Speed cameras will be even more important with narrower roads and more cyclists.</p>	
<p>segregated cycle lanes are essential for cycling with young children and connections to Q14 would be good</p>	
<p>These changes Segregated two-way cycleway on the south side of Salter Road</p> <p>Connection proposed to Quietway 14</p> <p>New raised crossing for cyclists</p>	

<p>Cycle priority provided across Norway Gate through raised junction to reduce the speed of turning traffic will make it safer for cyclists.</p>	
<p>Connecting to National Cycle Route C14 is a big plus and having a segregated lane will make it a lot safer</p>	
<p>Design at Norway Gate</p>	
<p>Risk of vehicles turning into Norway Gate colliding with people on bikes. The turning radius is not tight enough meaning that drivers can't see cyclists approaching from 'behind' them as they turn. Either the turning radius needs to be tighter by extending the protective kerb nearer the junction or setting the cycleway further back from Redriff Road so that drivers approach the cycleway at 90 degree angle.</p>	<p>The design of the minor junctions (Norway Gate) where they meet\ cross the Cycleway, is governed by the availability of road space. The designs have incorporated raised surfaces, small radius at the junction and continuation of the segregation as close to the junction as possible. At the detailed design stage this will be checked again.</p> <p>Once works commence a public awareness programme will take place, explaining to local residents how these junction layout should used</p>
<p>Support the narrowing of the mouth of the junction with Norway Gate</p>	
<p>General Comments</p>	
<p>more cycleways please</p>	
<p>May be covered. Generally are there ways for cyclists to access new cycle way along the route. Often someone decides you only join from one of two roads..and you find it hard to get onto the route mid way..</p>	<p>The kerb will be flush opposite Ropemaker Road to allow cyclists to join and leave the segregated cycle route</p>
<p>The two shared use pedestrian and cycle</p>	<p>Providing a segregated facility at these locations</p>

connections to Quietway 14 should instead be segregated use to avoid cycle / pedestrian conflict.

would require loss of planting, which we have tried to minimise.

Enjoyable environment

Comments and or suggestions

Response



No need for a separated two way cycle track (and I am a cyclist and use the road every day). The road is already safe with very limited traffic and speed is limited at 20mph. You would better ensure the

Four trees are affected within this section and four new locations for new trees have been identified. The designs developed to date we have taken great care to minimise the loss of trees. However they

<p>speed limit is respected.</p> <p>DO NOT CUT TREES or if you do plant more than you cut !</p> <p>Do not remove grass verges.</p>	<p>are not in the immediate vicinity of the trees.</p> <p>At the next design stage we will continue this and investigate opportunities to plant additional trees</p>
<p>The trees being lost should be replaced along this road otherwise it will continue to look bleak.</p>	
<p>Planting instead of verges</p>	
<p>Replace the grass verges with other greenery</p>	
<p>The removal of the grass verges will make it much more dangerous for pedestrians along Redriff Road, as pedestrians will be increasingly likely to come into contact with cars. It also will cause more visual pollution as the green verges will be replaced with grey tarmac.</p>	
<p>More trees not less. If 15 are being felled 9 is not a replacement. Should be 45.</p>	
<p>The council should increase the number of trees to compensate for the loss of mature trees</p>	
<p>I oppose the changes because it means the loss of a significant green verge and many trees. I know the plan notes that there will be a net gain in trees, but these will be in different locations to those that will be removed. This will change the quality of the street and walking environment. More trees, planting and landscaping should be provided to mitigate the proposed loss, not elsewhere but in the</p>	

<p>same locations and proximity to the loss.</p>	
<p>Redriff Road is extremely wide. The cycle way should not come at the expense of trees and greening. Design should aim to reduce vehicle lane widths to a minimum and maintain all the the trees and greening.</p>	
<p>Same as before regarding road verges. (Greenery is essential. Removal of so many trees and the road verge need to be compensated for.)</p>	
<p>I regret the loss of green space and trees.</p>	
<p>The road layout seems to work well at the moment. I cannot see any real benefit to the changes. Redriff/Salter Road has good visibility with grass verges along most of its length making it already safe for pedestrians and cyclists. Also the road currently does not seem to have much traffic.</p> <p>Removing the grass verges would detract from what is currently one of the most pleasant and safe in the area, I just do not think that this scheme justifies the cost.</p>	
<p>Strongly disagree with the latest as of grass verges for this use. Verges are important for the sense of space, wellbeing, water absorption and for the aesthetic of our area. No more hard surfaces needed.</p> <p>Disagree with loss of trees. Redriff road and salter</p>	

road are lined with trees it contributes to why we like being here and to the well-being off all of us.	
For the verges, could there also be some trees or bushes planted to make the area more attractive.	
I oppose the removal of the trees	
Oppose the removal of bus lay-bys, these ease the flow of traffic and most drivers let the bus out when it needs to pull out.	
Strongly oppose the removal of mature trees.	
I do support but the loss of trees will be a shame.	
Strongly support and suggest this might be a good location to plant a few new trees on the North West side	
Do not remove the speed camera, and plant back as many trees and shrubs as possible. Also keep as much green space as possible.	
suggest that the speed Camera is not removed and suggest this might be a good location to plant a few new trees on the North West side.	
Do not remove the speed camera. Also there might be a good location to plant trees on the north west side.	
Best if Speed Camera is not removed and this might be a good location to plant a few new trees on the North West side.	

<p>Taking away bus lay bys and loss of grass verges is madness , the grass verges help to give the area character</p>	
<p>Plant more trees, not just replace the four being moved.</p>	
<p>Please ensure your replacement trees are mature! At least 8 years old please. And do not stick them in concrete, if you want them to survive beyond 15 years. Do it right, do it properly!</p>	
<p>There should be no reduction in motor vehicle carriageway width as a result of introducing a cycle track.</p> <p>There should be no loss of grass verges.</p> <p>There should be no loss of bus lay-bys</p>	
<p>Please don't remove the speed camera.</p> <p>This could be a good place to plant some more trees, as some of the proposals are leading to a loss of trees - so important for flooding protection, air quality, tackling climate change...</p>	
<p>Speed camera should stay. With regards to trees, North West side is a good side for new trees</p>	
<p>Speed Camera is not removed and this might be a good location to plant a few new trees on the North West side</p>	
<p>Generally nice proposals but I think the speed</p>	

<p>camera should be kept to add some traffic control. A few more trees would also be good, maybe on the north west side</p>	
<p>Suggest the Speed Camera is not removed and suggest this might be a good location to plant a few new trees on the North West side.</p>	
<p>The speed camera should be relocated, not removed.</p> <p>A few new trees on the north west side would be nice to have.</p>	
<p>keep the Speed Camera is not removed and plant a few new trees on the North West side.</p>	
<p>We ask the council do not remove the speed camera and suggest in this section on the North West side there might be an opportunity to plant more trees. This would further add to the net gain of trees the plans provide. We also suggest there should be a gap in the kerb line to provide for access to and from Shipwright Road.</p>	
<p>I suggest that the speed camera not be removed and this would be a good location to plant a some native trees on the North West side.</p> <p>For trees near the roadside behind curbs, please used cut curbs so that rainwater can make its way to them. Also plant some native shrubs and other bushes around the trees.</p>	

<p>Furthermore, let's have as few curbs as possible. Use tactile paving instead of curbs to demarcate the border between the road and the pavement. If you are going to put in curbs, then those curbs should be bevelled. Non-bevelled curbs are an extreme danger to cyclists. TfL has started bevelled the curbs on its cycle lanes. Please do the same. Thank you.</p>	
<p>We ask the council do not remove the speed camera and suggest in this section on the North West side there might be an opportunity to plant more trees. This would further add to the net gain of trees the plans provide. We also suggest there should be a gap in the kerb line to provide for access to and from Shipwright Road.</p>	
<p>I suggest the Speed Camera is not removed and suggest this might be a good location to plant a few new trees on the North West side.</p>	

Improved junctions and/or traffic lights designs and phasing


Comments and or suggestions	Response
Norway Gate	
<p>Risk of vehicles turning into Norway Gate colliding with people on bikes. The turning radius is not tight enough meaning that drivers can't see cyclists approaching from 'behind' them as they turn. Either the turning radius needs to be tighter by extending the protective kerb nearer the junction or setting the cycleway further back from Redriff Road so that drivers approach the cycleway at 90 degree angle.</p>	<p>The design of the minor junctions (Norway Gate)) where they meet\ cross the Cycleway, is governed by the availability of road space. The designs have incorporated raised surfaces, small radius at the junction and continuation of the segregation as close to the junction as possible. At the detailed design stage this will be checked again.</p> <p>Once works commence a public awareness programme will take place, explaining to local residents how these junction layout should used.</p>
<p>Support the narrowing of the mouth of the junction with Norway Gate</p>	
<p>There are some quite imaginative changes here and I like the connections to QW14. Fully support the cycleway having priority over the junctions and the joint pedestrian-Cycleway zebra crossing.</p>	
<p>I oppose cycle priority across side roads and cyclists using pedestrian path to Quietway 14.</p> <p>I oppose commingling cyclist crossing point with pedestrian zebra crossing. These two should be kept separate and a cyclist crossing should not have priority over cars driving on Salter Road /</p>	<p>A cyclist having priority across a side road is no different than the existing road layout, vehicles turning in or out of Norway Gate, would be expected to give way to cyclists on Redriff Road. The only difference it that the cycleway has two way flow.</p>

Redriff Road.	
Raise road on Norway gate unnecessary	The raised road into Norway Gate has benefits for cyclists and pedestrians. For pedestrians, particularly those with pushchairs etc, the road and footway at the same level will assist them crossing. For all road users it will help reduce the speed of traffic leaving Salter Road. It also give drivers a visual message to take care
These changes Segregated two-way cycleway on the south side of Salter Road Connection proposed to Quietway 14 New raised crossing for cyclists Cycle priority provided across Norway Gate through raised junction to reduce the speed of turning traffic will make it safer for cyclists.	A cyclist having priority across a side road is no different than the existing road layout, vehicles turning in or out of Norway Gate, would be expected to give way to cyclists on Redriff Road. The only difference it that the cycleway has two way flow
We ask the council do not remove the speed camera and suggest in this section on the North West side there might be an opportunity to plant more trees. This would further add to the net gain of trees the plans provide. We also suggest there should be a gap in the kerb line to provide for access to and from Shipwright Road.	A gap is proposed within the bus border, which allows cyclist to enter and leave Shipwright Road
We ask the council do not remove the speed camera and suggest in this section on the North West side there might be an opportunity to plant	

more trees. This would further add to the net gain of trees the plans provide. We also suggest there should be a gap in the kerb line to provide for access to and from Shipwright Road.	
--	--

Improved public transport (reliability, more & direct routes, accessibility, overcrowding)	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Loss of bus lay-bys is unacceptable and will significantly reduce traffic flow. The lay-bys need to be retained	To bus users the lay-bys have little benefit, bus drivers are reliant on drivers allowing them to pull away from the lay-by. A bus in the carriageway is much more able to pull away. This type of road layout is common across Southwark and London. It will not reduce traffic flow
The removal of bus lay-bys and the narrowing of the road are concerning with not other addition of traffic calming measures. A lot of traffic on this road ignores the 20mph speed limit. Cars overtaking the frequent bus services on this route have the potential to reduce the road safety of this section.	
Bus lay-bys are good at keeping the flow of traffic going in the area.	
Oppose the removal of bus lay-bys, these ease the flow of traffic and most drivers let the bus out when it needs to pull out.	
Strongly oppose the removal of mature trees.	
Please refer to previous comments which equally apply. (Removal of bus lay bys will mean that traffic will be stopped as there will be inadequate room for	

<p>passing. This will cause traffic delays.</p> <p>Cycle lane and width restrictions not required as no one will use it - there will not be a Rotherhithe Bridge.</p> <p>Don't forget that the road speed in this area is already restricted to 20 mph.)</p>	
<p>I am concerned at the removal of the bus lay bus and the effect this will have on the movement of traffic in this and the proposal generally. In an ideal world i would have no issue but as a cyclist I recognise that frustrated drivers can be dangerous drivers.</p>	
<p>Taking away bus lay bys and loss of grass verges is madness , the grass verges help to give the area character</p>	
<p>There should be no reduction in motor vehicle carriageway width as a result of introducing a cycle track.</p> <p>There should be no loss of grass verges.</p> <p>There should be no loss of bus lay-bys</p>	



Moving bus stops...transport for locals to enable cyclists to get to & from work work?

Support, although i'm concerned about the removal of the bus stop to the north of the road as it is one myself and friends use regularly


Pedestrian crossings are not close enough to the bus stop - people will still run across the road and will have issues with both the normal road and the bike lanes now.

Where is the bus stop in the direction of Rotherhithe station going to be? Now seem very far apart

The new shared use pedestrian and cycle paths connecting to proposed Quietway 14 will be hazardous for pedestrians. There simply isn't enough room for both!

The relocation of the bus stop shown furthest to the right of the plan, near to the boundary with section

The bus stops on this section are only being moved a few metres. The blue circles show the existing location. Red the proposed new location

<p>19 will create greater inconvenience for many people.</p> <p>Shouldn't part of what you've labelled "Bonding Yard Walk" be labelled "Lady Dock Path"?</p>	
<p>Removing the bus stops which more of the community use over cyclist.</p>	
<p>I oppose any bus route roads being reduced in size to accommodate cycle lanes . Cycle lanes should be put on parallel / nearby roads that do not carry buses .</p> <p>This is safer for the cyclists .</p> <p>Also cycle lanes taking out road space slow down the buses (an absolutely crucial transport service for an area poorly served by the underground).</p> <p>Once the cycle route is in place TfL will reduce the bus service , either shortening the route or reducing frequency as the services will run slower than currently</p>	<p>There are no planned changes to bus routes as a result of these proposals</p>
<p>Why do I bother? The same problems continue as in the last several questions!!!</p> <p>(Oooops. Even if I am still alive after the three sets of traffic lights, I shall now have to contend with an unnecessary zebra crossing as well. Will the buses ever be able to move, or are they being discontinued?)</p>	

More and safer cycle infrastructure/ routes	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Segregated cycling is essential here to improve safety and reduce air pollution.	
I think its extremely important to segregate cycle lanes from the rest of traffic. I have been commuting by bicycle on this road for nearly ten years and I have lost count of the number of reckless impatient drivers (cars, vans, buses and taxis) that have nearly or actually knocked me off of my bicycle.	
These changes Segregated two-way cycleway on the south side of Salter Road Connection proposed to Quietway 14 New raised crossing for cyclists Cycle priority provided across Norway Gate through raised junction to reduce the speed of turning traffic will make it safer for cyclists.	
This stretch is not cyclist-friendly at present and full of speeding and rat-running motor vehicles.	
Connecting to National Cycle Route C14 is a big plus and having a segregated lane will make it a lot safer	
Big fan of connecting with the Quietway	

I like the integration with the quietway. Quietways are a win-win for both cyclists and pedestrians. They should be signed much more prominently. I don't agree with the removal of the speed camera. Speed cameras will be even more important with narrower roads and more cyclists.	
segregated cycle lanes are essential for cycling with young children and connections to Q14 would be good	
more cycleways please	

Other	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Will drivers know to give way to cyclists using the crossing? There will need to be signs reminding drivers to give way to bikes at the junctions	Once works commence a public awareness programme will take place, explaining to local residents how these junction layout should be used.
If cyclist could proceed when safe to do so this would be acceptable. Otherwise it just delays cyclist and the safety benefits do not outweigh this. I cannot imagine there are many recordings of cyclist incidents. This data has not been provided.	

Reduced on street parking	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Same comments apply	

<p>(How many cyclists are there to justify this road? I agree with the double yellow lines and the zebra crossing.)</p>	
---	--

River crossings	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>No bridge no need for route.. WHITE ELEPHANT. Please refer to previous comments which equally apply. (Removal of bus lay bys will mean that traffic will be stopped as there will be inadequate room for passing. This will cause traffic delays. Cycle lane and width restrictions not required as no one will use it - there will not be a Rotherhithe Bridge. Don't forget that the road speed in this area is already restricted to 20 mph.)</p>	<p>This proposal aims to link to existing and proposed routes in the area and provide a link to Cycleway 4. It will also provide a key local route to local facilities and destinations further afield. A ferry option is still being investigated should this be taken forward this proposal will complement the crossing</p>

Road maintenance	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>The surface of Bonding Yard Walk really ought to be refurbished and improved in order to make the connection to the proposed cycleway an enjoyable one. It's currently in poor condition and a poor choice of material makes this problem worse.</p>	<p>It is proposed to clean the existing surface</p>

Safer speeds	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Speed Camera	
Why remove the speed camera? This actually does slow drivers down	<p>Southwark to not have the powers to enforce speed limits; however our designs can influence drivers speeds. In this instance the narrowing of the carriageway width has been proved to reduce traffic speeds.</p> <p>We will be discussing with the police the future of the existing speed camera with a view to finding a suitable location</p>
We would like the speed camera to remain (somewhere along the road, especially by Capstan Way) as frequent speeding along this route as it is a nice straight road	
Cycle lane is completely unnecessary	
Please do not remove speed cameras! There are people driving at outrageous speeds on this road everyday. Cyclists, cars and motorbikes alike have a blatant disregard for the 20mph limit. A cycle lane will encourage cyclists to go faster and so will the removal of speed cameras.	
Shame about the speed camera, it is working very well! (I live 100m from it)	
"New shared use pedestrian and cycle path connection to proposed Quietway 14": Lovely!	
Keep the speed camera!	
I like the integration with the quietway. Quietways are a win-win for both cyclists and pedestrians. They should be signed much more prominently. I don't agree with the removal of the speed	

<p>camera. Speed cameras will be even more important with narrower roads and more cyclists.</p>	
<p>I believe that the speed camera should be retained, at least until you have evaluated the effects of narrowing the road. My perception is that traffic speeds are noticeably reduced on the section where there is the speed camera (and of course the speed camera sign).</p> <p>As an alternative, I would very much support the relocating the camera to stretch of Salter Road that hadn't been narrowed.</p>	
<p>Why remove the speed camera? I see a lot of speeding along Redriff Road/Salter Road.</p>	
<p>Do not remove the speed camera, and plant back as many trees and shrubs as possible. Also keep as much green space as possible.</p>	
<p>suggest that the speed Camera is not removed and suggest this might be a good location to plant a few new trees on the North West side.</p>	
<p>Please do not remove the speed camera.</p>	
<p>Do not remove the speed camera.</p> <p>Also there might be a good location to plant trees on the north west side.</p>	
<p>Best if Speed Camera is not removed and this might be a good location to plant a few new trees</p>	

on the North West side.	
I would feel safer if the speed camera was not removed. Drivers speeding the area is a particular problem	
Do NOT remove the speed camera. There are not enough anyway and people use this road as a race track and kill children, cats and foxes!	
The removal of the speed camera is not supported...speed on Salter Road and Redriff Road are notoriously high.	
please keep the speed camera. I live locally and people frequently speed along this road at dangerous speeds using it as a rat run, despite it being close to Redriff school and the Docklands settlement community centre and many children crossing the road. I have seen several near misses when children have been at risk of being hit by a car.	
Please don't remove the speed camera.	
This could be a good place to plant some more trees, as some of the proposals are leading to a loss of trees - so important for flooding protection, air quality, tackling climate change...	
Speed camera should stay. With regards to trees, North West side is a good side for new trees	
Speed Camera is not removed and this might be a good location to plant a few new trees on the North	

West side	
Generally nice proposals but I think the speed camera should be kept to add some traffic control. A few more trees would also be good, maybe on the north west side	
Can we not keep the speed camera? Can we not have lots more speed cameras across the borough?	
Suggest the Speed Camera is not removed and suggest this might be a good location to plant a few new trees on the North West side.	
The speed camera should be relocated, not removed. A few new trees on the north west side would be nice to have.	
keep the Speed Camera is not removed and plant a few new trees on the North West side.	
We ask the council do not remove the speed camera and suggest in this section on the North West side there might be an opportunity to plant more trees. This would further add to the net gain of trees the plans provide. We also suggest there should be a gap in the kerb line to provide for access to and from Shipwright Road.	
I suggest that the speed camera not be removed and this would be a good location to plant a some native trees on the North West side.	

<p>For trees near the roadside behind curbs, please use cut curbs so that rainwater can make its way to them. Also plant some native shrubs and other bushes around the trees.</p> <p>Furthermore, let's have as few curbs as possible. Use tactile paving instead of curbs to demarcate the border between the road and the pavement. If you are going to put in curbs, then those curbs should be bevelled. Non-bevelled curbs are an extreme danger to cyclists. TfL has started bevelled curbs on its cycle lanes. Please do the same. Thank you.</p>	
<p>We ask the council do not remove the speed camera and suggest in this section on the North West side there might be an opportunity to plant more trees. This would further add to the net gain of trees the plans provide. We also suggest there should be a gap in the kerb line to provide for access to and from Shipwright Road.</p>	
<p>I suggest the Speed Camera is not removed and suggest this might be a good location to plant a few new trees on the North West side.</p>	
<p>Speed Limit \ speeding</p>	
<p>No need for a separated two way cycle track (and I am a cyclist and use the road every day). The road is already safe with very limited traffic and speed is limited at 20mph. You would better ensure</p>	<p>Research has shown that narrowing the road width, has a positive effect on reducing speeds. The road width at the crossing is 6 metres, so a significant</p>

<p>the speed limit is respected.</p> <p>DO NOT CUT TREES or if you do plant more than you cut !</p> <p>Do not remove grass verges.</p>	<p>enough reduction to induce slower speeds</p>
<p>This stretch is not cyclist-friendly at present and full of speeding and rat-running motor vehicles.</p>	
<p>The removal of bus lay-bys and the narrowing of the road are concerning with not other addition of traffic calming measures. A lot of traffic on this road ignores the 20mph speed limit. Cars overtaking the frequent bus services on this route have the potential to reduce the road safety of this section.</p>	

Safety	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>The removal of bus lay-bys and the narrowing of the road are concerning with not other addition of traffic calming measures. A lot of traffic on this road ignores the 20mph speed limit. Cars overtaking the frequent bus services on this route have the potential to reduce the road safety of this section.</p>	<p>Research has shown that narrowing the road width, has a positive effect on reducing speeds. The road width at the crossing is 6 metres, so a significant enough reduction to induce slower speeds</p>

Segregation between cyclist and pedestrians

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>The new shared use pedestrian and cycle paths connecting to proposed Quietway 14 will be hazardous for pedestrians. There simply isn't enough room for both!</p> <p>The relocation of the bus stop shown furthest to the right of the plan, near to the boundary with section 19 will create greater inconvenience for many people.</p> <p>Shouldn't part of what you've labelled "Bonding Yard Walk" be labelled "Lady Dock Path"?</p>	<p>To provide a segregated facility at this location would have impacted further on green areas, which we have tried to minimise. Shared paths can be used acceptable over short lengths.</p>
<p>The two shared use pedestrian and cycle connections to Quietway 14 should instead be segregated use to avoid cycle / pedestrian conflict.</p>	
<p>I oppose cycle priority across side roads and cyclists using pedestrian path to Quietway 14.</p> <p>I oppose commingling cyclist crossing point with pedestrian zebra crossing. These two should be kept separate and a cyclist crossing should not have priority over cars driving on Salter Road / Redriff Road.</p>	<p>The crossing is segregated with Cyclist and Pedestrians having their own allocated crossing point.</p>
<p>I also strongly oppose the kerb on the segregated cycleway. This will make crossing the road with a</p>	<p>Zebra crossing are proposed across both Salter Road and Rotherhithe Street, which will assist push</p>

pram very difficult.

chair and wheel chair users

Clarity and awareness on how to share the road and mutual respect

Comments and or suggestions	Response
tiger crossings need to be explained to motorists. motorists often think they have right of ways, which can create fatal conflicts.	Once works commence a public awareness programme will take place, explaining to local residents how these junction layout should used

Improve air quality

Comments and or suggestions	Response
Oh dear. More crossings, more crawling along, more horrible air pollution. I wonder if my car will have run out of fuel by now, as it will probably have taken me an hour of more to travel this far from the shopping centre, less than half a mile away. I can absolutely guarantee that I shall be struggling to breathe at all by now.	The provision of safer cycle facilities will give people the opportunity to cycle rather than drive, which will assist in the improvement of air quality. As will the provision of crossings, this will also assist and encourage active travel.

Crossing roads is easy and safe

Comments and or suggestions	Response
It looks like cars will come very fast into this junction and run over people cycling and walking on the zebra crossing! Could the junction be made tighter?	In conjunction with the cycle layout the crossings have been redesigned to reduce traffic speeds and ensure the crossings are in the optimum position for all road users.
As again with cycle lane.	The new layout also takes into account crossing

<p>I like the zebra crossing across salter rd.</p> <p>The one across the entrance To Rotherhithe street was abandoned in the past as a danger. Bus and cars turning into Rotherhithe street are not given any warning and may not see the crossing.</p>	<p>from the south side of Rotherhithe Street</p>
<p>Strongly support and it would be good for the junction to be squared up and junction mouth to be narrowed for motor traffic. This will help reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer.</p>	
<p>Reduce motor traffic speeds and make the crossing safer, by squaring up the junction mouth, and narrowing it for motor traffic.</p>	
<p>The pedestrian crossings need traffic light support because of the crossing of many school children - there is also more traffic at school time.</p>	
<p>junction to be squared up and junction mouth to be narrowed for motor traffic. This will help reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer.</p>	
<p>Please square up the junction and make the entry narrower for motor traffic. This will help reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer.</p>	
<p>Square up the junction. Also narrow the junction mouth for motor traffic. This will reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer.</p>	
<p>the junction to be squared up and junction mouth to be narrowed for motor traffic. This will help reduce</p>	

traffic speeds and make the crossing safer.	
To help reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer I would suggest squaring up the junction and narrowing its mouth for motor traffic	
narrow the road to slow down traffic	
maybe narrow the junction to slow motor traffic	
I strongly support changes to the junction between Rotherhithe St and Salter Rd. It is extremely difficult to cross the road here with children as traffic is coming from several directions and drivers are frequently driving too fast. There are lots of children crossing here due to proximity of the Docklands settlement community centre, Redriff school, Trinity nursery and Surrey Docks farm. Is it possible to narrow the car lanes of the junction and road to encourage car drivers to travel more slowly, as I frequently see drivers travelling too fast and turning too quickly at this junction.	
The crossing across salter road must be continuous, the current crossing island is very narrow and you cannot stand behind your pram on the island. Again cars frequently travel too fast here and there is a risk of young children stepping out in front of traffic rather than waiting on the island, I have seen several worrying near misses when children have not stopped on the island.	
It would be good to narrow the mouth of the junction to reduce traffic flow and speed, making it	

safer for cyclists.	
Good that there will be 2 new trees.	
junction to be squared up and junction mouth to be narrowed for motor traffic. This will help reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer.	
This is good, but is it possible to make the junction squarer and narrow the entrance? This should hopefully slow traffic speeds somewhat.	
We suggest asking for the junction to be squared up and junction mouth to be narrowed for motor traffic. This will help reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer.	
Zebra crossing immediately after turning into Rotherhithe Street is potentially hazardous.	
Unclear why tree needs to be removed on Salter Road at that location.	
The turn radius on the junction are too large. It should be squared up and made narrower to control traffic speeds.	
junction to be squared up and junction mouth to be narrowed for motor traffic. This will help reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer.	
Please (a) square up the junction; and (b) narrow the mouth of the junction for motor traffic. This will help reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer.	

<p>Also, let's have as few curbs as possible. Use tactile paving instead of curbs to demarcate the border between the road and the pavement. If you are going to put in curbs, then those curbs should be bevelled. Non-bevelled curbs are a extreme danger to cyclists. TfL has started bevelling the curbs on its cycle lanes. Please do the same. Thank you.</p>	
<p>We ask the junction be narrowed and squared up as much as possible. We are aware the local bus C10 needs some of the wider angles but those arms/directions not used by the bus should be square as possible to ensure motorists taking the turns do so as slowly as possible as this will reduce the risk to those in the cycle lane. As well as encouraging drivers to follow the designed intent and give way to the cyclelane and those on the crossing</p>	
<p>Please reflect on the arcs of the roads corners, and see if the junction can be squared up and junction mouth to be narrowed for motor traffic. This will help reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer.</p>	
<p>I suggest the junction to be squared up and junction mouth to be narrowed for motor traffic. This will help reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer.</p>	
<p>In general, I support this but this is a very</p>	<p>The new layout also takes into account crossing</p>

<p>dangerous junction and I don't think you've properly looked at the problems with your solution here.</p> <p>If you remove the give way signs that are currently positioned at the end of Rotherhithe street, cars will whip round that corner so fast causing potential accidents with cars coming out of the other side of Rotherhithe Street and pedestrians / cyclists. At least the current give way lines force cases to stop and be a bit more careful.</p> <p>Re pedestrians, the zebra crossing inside Rotherhithe Street will help people going sting across the road but I think this design neglects people who are turning into Rotherhithe Street from Salter Road. Most pedestrians tend to cross on the bend where there is currently a give way sign on the floor, also highlight my point above as dangerous. You should consider moving the zebra crossing, or adding one on the bend, or keeping the current give way signs.</p> <p>Please go and stand there for a day and you will see exactly what I'm talking about.</p>	<p>from the south side of Rotherhithe Street</p>
<p>From experience walking in the area, as a pedestrian, especially with wheels (wheelbarrow, pram, wheelchair), if walking from Surrey Docks Farm to Salter Road (and viceversa), I would stick to the south pavement of as much as possible because there are no (as opposed to three) side</p>	

<p>roads to negotiate. So it feels like there is an unsatisfied desire line and there should be an additional pedestrian crossing, to cross from the East side of Rotherhithe Street to the North section of Salter Road.</p> <p>The loading bay in front of the community centre is a complete excuse, it's constantly in use by parents who drive and park while they wait for their progeny to finish their lessons. It should be removed and the cycle lane allowed to cross the junction more naturally.</p> <p>Wouldn't it be great if those cycle lanes could extend further into Salter Road and go around the peninsula? Hopefully in the near future... :-)</p> <p>Presumably the existing "Downtown Road" bus stop northbound is going to be removed/merged southerly with Shipwright Road? It doesn't say on the plans.</p>	
<p>Zebra crossings are acceptable.</p>	
<p>Zebra crossings are in sensible positions</p> <p>No need for cycle lanes</p> <p>double yellow lanes can only be removed if sufficient parking is provided for parents using docklands settlements</p>	

Do not remove trees. Best thing about Rotherhithe is all the trees.	
I strongly oppose the kerb on the segregated cycleway. This will make crossing the road with a pram very difficult.	Zebra crossing are proposed across both Salter Road and Rotherhithe Street, which will assist push chair and wheel chair users
<p>We need traffic lights on the junction of Salter Rd and Rotherhithe Str.</p> <p>There's a busy school nearby (Redriff PLCA) and on the corner there's the Docklands Settlement with many activities for children and families. Salter street crossing is absolutely not safe because of the curve. Rotherhithe street's 'neck' is too wide to cross safely with all the turning traffic. There are buses on both roads.</p>	Initial designs for this location investigated traffic signals, roundabout and the layout consulted on, overall it was considered that a priority junction was most appropriate.

Do not agree with traffic calming/reduction and cycle lanes

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Meaningless cycle lane on Rotherhithe Street in already narrow road where buses find it difficult to turn.</p> <p>Rotherhithe St is a very narrow street. Any attempt to make it even more narrower to appease cyclists, who pay no road tax or insurance is madness. There is enough antagonism between cyclists and motorists. Also, how much money is spent on cycle routes that could be better spent on housing or</p>	There is no cycle lane proposed in Rotherhithe Street, the proposals for Rotherhithe Street are aimed at making it a more pleasant cycle whilst aiming to improve traffic flow, particularly for the C10 bus route.

health!!	
<p>No need for a separated two way cycle track (and I am a cyclist and use the road every day). The road is already safe with very limited traffic and speed is limited at 20mph. You would better ensure the speed limit is respected.</p> <p>DO NOT remove grass verges.</p>	<p>The provision of safer cycle facilities will give people the opportunity to cycle rather than drive, which will assist in the improvement of air quality. As will the provision of crossings, this will also assist and encourage active travel.</p>
Opposed to the segregated cycleway	
Do not see the need for this cycle route, there is enough already within the Peninsular.	
<p>Zebra crossings are in sensible positions</p> <p>No need for cycle lanes</p> <p>double yellow lanes can only be removed if sufficient parking is provided for parents using docklands settlements</p> <p>Do not remove trees. Best thing about Rotherhithe is all the trees.</p>	
<p>Please refer previous comments.</p> <p>(Removal of bus lay bys will mean that traffic will be stopped as there will be inadequate room for passing. This will cause traffic delays.</p> <p>Cycle lane and width restrictions not required as no one will use it - there will not be a Rotherhithe Bridge.</p>	

Don't forget that the road speed in this area is already restricted to 20 mph.)	
There should be no reduction in motor vehicle carriageway width as a result of introducing a cycle track.	
There should be no loss of bus lay-bys	
There should be no loss of parking	
<p>The road layout seems to work well at the moment. I cannot see any real benefit to the changes. Redriff/Salter Road has good visibility with grass verges along most of its length making it already safe for pedestrians and cyclists. Also the road currently does not seem to have much traffic.</p> <p>This road is already one of the most pleasant and safe in the area, I just do not think that this scheme justifies the cost.</p>	

Easy and safe to cycle	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>is it worthwhile having a gap in the segregation just south of the loading bay, allowing cyclists to join the regular traffic lanes?</p> <p>that way cyclists don't have to give way to pedestrians twice and traffic twice while cycling</p>	<p>There isn't sufficient space to allow a suitable design to permit this, however looking at a redesign of the junction we have attempted to minimise the impact for those cyclists crossing Rotherhithe Street</p>

down salter rd	
It's an overly complicated intersection for cyclists.	The points raised here are being reviewed as part of a redesign to take into account the concerns that have been raised. The concerns raised look to improve the design rather than challenge the principles of what is trying to be achieved
It looks like cars will come very fast into this junction and run over people cycling and walking on the zebra crossing! Could the junction be made tighter?	
Not great that the cycleway doesn't continue straight across the Rotherhithe Street junction here. Will it be clear enough to motorists to give way here to cyclists on the crossing?	
<p>This looks particularly confusing for users of all modes of transport (motor vehicle, bicycles and pedestrians) as these road markings look confusing - particularly for people crossing the link road between Rotherhithe Street and Salter Road. There are potentially six lanes of traffic to cross - there are two two-way cyclelanes with a two way road in the middle. In addition, all cars and bicycles turning will be turning corners here, meaning that people will be at a high danger of being hit by either a car or bicycle turning inattentively.</p> <p>I also query whether this proposal will be effective - I feel that cyclists using Salter Road are more likely to come off their cycleway and cycle along the road rather than turn a corner, wait to cross at a raised crossing and then turn again - this therefore increases the chances of a collision between cars and bicycles.</p>	

Not great. Why is the turning radius for vehicles entering/leaving Rotherhithe Street left so wide? This encourages high-speed vehicle movements, directly approaching a pedestrian and cycle crossing. Also the order/positioning of the cycle and zebra crossings should be reversed on Rotherhithe Street. With the crossings in the order shown someone travelling on a bike North to South alongside SalterRoad would, in the space of a few metres, have to 1) Give way at a zebra crossing 2) Give way at another zebra crossing, 3) Give way to cyclists coming over the highway who are turning right 4) Cross the highway 5) Give way to cyclists coming from the left 6) Give way again at the other side of the same zebra crossing they'd just given way at! It's just too complex/cumbersome

Strong support for the cycleway, however I have one reservation.

Please, please, please use a different colour tarmac on the parallel crossings where the cycle track crosses motor traffic carriageway at non-signalised junctions (such as this junction). The carriageway tarmac should be coloured red, blue, or green highlighting the path that cyclists would take across the path of motor traffic.

Parallel crossings are a relatively new invention and countless times I have seen near-misses at them between cars and cyclists because drivers are

unfamiliar with them and do not realise they must stop and give way to cyclists. I think a large part of this is because the tarmac is the same colour as a 'normal' piece of road carriageway, subtly suggesting that it is 'space for vehicles'. If the tarmac was a different colour where the cycleway crosses, it would send a subtle message to drivers that that section of carriageway is not a 'normal' area, which would hugely improve cyclist safety.

Many motorists slow down and apply caution as they approach a zebra crossing, but once they have passed through it they mentally view the tarmac on the far side as a space where they can go back to driving normally. This is a huge safety risk to cyclists as motorists are not looking for them and expected them to cycle into the carriageway. Changing the colour of the cycleway crossing to an 'abnormal' colour counteracts this safety risk to a high degree, as motorists would not mentally view that carriageway space as 'normal'.

Coloured paint is slippery, yes, which is itself a safety risk to cyclists. Therefore, please invest a bit more money and lay down dyed tarmac instead, rather than painting over normal tarmac. This is more expensive but the investment will be worth the safety benefits. This practice is already done in other areas of London - see Waltham Forest Borough Council and their red-dyed tarmac cycle

lanes that they have recently built on Lea Bridge Road. The different colour clearly communicates cyclist space, and the tarmac is dyed red, so that no slippery coloured paint needs to be used. Also see TfLs plans for Cycleway 4 on Jamaica Road in Rotherhithe - where the cycleway crosses side roads, the tarmac is proposed to be a blue colour.

In summary, please use a different coloured tarmac for the cycle track where it crosses the main carriageway at all parallel crossings, and non-signalised side-road crossings, on the route.

I see what you are trying to do here but I don't think it will work and it will frustrate cyclists. It would feel even more of a faff because you would have to bend round away from Salter Road, then back onto it, then cross over the road to get onto the other side. Cycle movement has to be kept as direct and simple as possible and this is the opposite of that. I would therefore keep the Cycleway along Salter Road with a priority over cars turning to/from Rotherhithe St. The pedestrian zebra crossing across Rotherhithe St would be in the same place as in the proposals.

For cyclists turning from Rotherhithe St onto Salter Road heading south (i.e. towards Surrey Quays shopping centre) there would be simple left turn which could be segregated from the main road. If they are turning right (i.e. heading they can just join

<p>the Cycleway and follow its priority along Salter Road).</p> <p>For cyclists turning right or left from Salter Road onto Rotherhithe St you can keep the suggested cycle track, this would work well with my proposal to keep the Cycleway along Salter Rd, rather than jutting into Rotherhithe St then back out again.</p>	
<p>Good positioning of the loading bay. I don't agree with making cyclists turn the corner to go down the side street before crossing and turning back onto the main road. It will slow down cyclists and discourage them from using the cycleway. The cyclists should be given right of way over the junction.</p>	
<p>I support, but I would rather cyclists were able to carry on straight onto Salter road as they currently are</p>	
<p>The wide corner radius for motor traffic turning from Rotherhithe Street (south) onto Salter road means traffic may not be going slow enough to spot cycles coming from Rotherhithe Street (north) to Salter Road, which would have priority.</p> <p>I think a coloured surface treatment for the painted lane in front of the give way line is necessary here for this reason, so that drivers are aware that they need to slow down and look for vulnerable road users coming around the corner.</p>	

The path for cyclists to join Rotherhithe Street from the proposed cycleway is also insufficient. After the zebra crossing, the cycle lane into Rotherhithe Street should continue parallel to the general traffic lane for a short distance so that cycle priority is maintained when merging with other traffic on Rotherhithe Street. The current arrangement makes priorities unclear for cycles in this position, especially with regard to motor traffic coming from Rotherhithe Street (south).

I agree that segregated cycle lanes should not be necessary for Rotherhithe Street here but, Rotherhithe Street is not sufficiently traffic-calmed to make this section an easy, accessible ride at all times for less experienced cyclists or young children. I would like to see the implementation of modal filters along Rotherhithe Street so that resident access is maintained while preventing through traffic for all modes other than buses and cycles.

We ask the junction be narrowed and squared up as much as possible. We are aware the local bus C10 needs some of the wider angles but those arms/directions not used by the bus should be square as possible to ensure motorists taking the turns do so as slowly as possible as this will reduce the risk to those in the cycle lane. As well as encouraging drivers to follow the designed intent

and give way to the cyclelane and those on the crossing	
Segregated cycling is essential here to improve safety and reduce air pollution	
This stretch is not cyclist-friendly at present and full of speeding and rat-running motor vehicles.	
<p>Please flip the ped crossing and the cycle crossing. Now you potentially have cycleway 4 users who will need to cross pedestrians waiting area, cross the street, and cross a pedestrian waiting area once again. Makes more sense to have the cycle crossing at the top and the ped crossing on the bottom.</p> <p>The crossing could be straight for cyclists to be honest, not sure why cyclists are forced to make slight turns in/out of Rotherhithe Street?</p>	The order of the crossing has been changed in the redesign
Overall support - especially introduction of double yellow lines along this part of the route as parked traffic causes many issues. Slightly concerned about the loading bay location for docklands settlements as could cause issues for those loading into this space and clashes with cyclists	This is considered the optimum position for the loading bay there is good visibility at this location together with good widths.
From experience walking in the area, as a pedestrian, especially with wheels (wheelbarrow, pram, wheelchair), if walking from Surrey Docks Farm to Salter Road (and viceversa), I would stick to the south pavement of as much as possible because there are no (as opposed to three) side	

<p>roads to negotiate. So it feels like there is an unsatisfied desire line and there should be an additional pedestrian crossing, to cross from the East side of Rotherhithe Street to the North section of Salter Road.</p> <p>The loading bay in front of the community centre is a complete excuse, it's constantly in use by parents who drive and park while they wait for their progeny to finish their lessons. It should be removed and the cycle lane allowed to cross the junction more naturally.</p> <p>Wouldn't it be great if those cycle lanes could extend further into Salter Road and go around the peninsula? Hopefully in the near future... :-)</p> <p>Presumably the existing "Downtown Road" bus stop northbound is going to be removed/merged southerly with Shipwright Road? It doesn't say on the plans.</p>	
<p>The 90 degree turns look like they could be difficult for our cargo bikes to navigate. Would support swept path analysis that shows that these turns are possible for cargo and otherwise adapted cycles.</p> <p>The junction mouth for Rotherhithe Street is very wide which could encourage higher speed turns to be undertaken by motor vehicles</p>	<p>This has been considered at our redesign and will be checked again at the detailed design stage</p>

<p>As the Rotherhithe Street doesn't have any segregated tracks it would be nice to see some traffic reduction measures which ensure through traffic takes Salter Road instead of Rotherhithe Street</p>	<p>Rotherhithe Street is used predominately by local traffic and is not considered to be taking rat-running traffic. So any filtered permeability would most likely not displace traffic. As Salter Road is the only alternative and is considered most likely to be a route traffic would choice to use.</p>
<p>more cycleways please</p>	
<p>segregated cycle lanes are essential for cycling with young children.</p>	
<p>I think its extremely important to segregate cycle lanes from the rest of traffic. I have been commuting by bicycle on this road for nearly ten years and I have lost count of the number of reckless impatient drivers (cars, vans, buses and taxis) that have nearly or actually knocked me off of my bicycle - the most dangerous road users in my opinion are generally the buses and taxis which share the current bus lanes with cyclists.</p>	
<p>These changes Segregated two-way cycleway on the south side of Salter Road</p> <p>Changed priorities at Rotherhithe Street will provide continuous route for southbound cyclists</p> <p>New cycle crossings across Salter Road and Rotherhithe Street will make it safer for cyclists.</p>	

Enjoyable environment

Comments and or suggestions

Response



No need for a separated two way cycle track (and I am a cyclist and use the road every day). The road is already safe with very limited traffic and speed is limited at 20mph. You would better ensure the speed limit is respected.

DO NOT remove grass verges.

More trees not less. If 15 are being felled 9 is not a replacement. Should be 45.

I oppose the changes because it means the loss of a significant green verge and many trees. I know the plan notes that there will be a net gain in trees, but these will be in different locations to those that will be removed. This will change the quality of the

One tree is affected within this section and two new locations for a tree has been identified. The designs developed to date we have taken great care to minimise the loss of trees.

The tree lost on Salter Road is effected by the new kerb line and can't be retained but a new tree can be planted close by.

Depending the exact details of the revised junction layout this tree may be able too be retained

street and walking environment. More trees, planting and landscaping should be provided to mitigate the proposed loss, not elsewhere but in the same locations and proximity to the loss.	
More trees and greening should be considered.	
Disagree with tree removal and the new crossings. Unnecessary.	
Noting the tree is removed, can this be replaced by other planting.	
I strongly strongly strongly support the double yellow lines on one side of Rotherhithe street. Cars on both sides of the road are currently a safety issue preventing emergency vehicle access to Odessa Street and Elgar Street. These yellow lines should be added as a priority and should not be contingent on the other changes taking place.	
I oppose the removal of the trees	
Do not see why existing mature tree needs to be removed. Otherwise support.	
All the same reasons as stated before	
Also the removal of trees is terrible, the wording states only proposed replacement of them (Taking away bus lay bys and loss of grass verges is madness , the grass verges help to give the area character)	
It would be good to narrow the mouth of the	

<p>junction to reduce traffic flow and speed, making it safer for cyclists.</p> <p>Good that there will be 2 new trees.</p>	<p>[Blue shaded area]</p>
<p>Zebra crossing immediately after turning into Rotherhithe Street is potentially hazardous.</p> <p>Unclear why tree needs to be removed on Salter Road at that location.</p>	
<p>wide pavements give opportunity for more planting, trees and suds..make the most of them please. are there integrated cycle racks?</p>	
<p>Excellent idea to plant more trees</p>	<p>[Blue shaded area]</p>
<p>Having a segregated lane will make it a lot safer, also positive 2 trees are replacing the 1 removed, more trees are a bonus.</p>	

Feeling safe from crime and injury

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>1. Traffic signals will significantly slow down local buses in the area, which are already very slow and it takes a long while to get to the nearest tube/overground stations. This adds a lot to overall commute time.</p> <p>2. Rotherhithe Street is very narrow and it's really struggling with 2 way traffic at peak times. A cycle track will only make the situation worse.</p> <p>3. The increased number of cyclists in the area will make it less safe for walking, especially for children and parents with a buggy, it will also increase the amount of garbage on the streets and will likely lead to the increased crime rate too.</p>	<p>It is not considered likely that the introduction of a cycle route will lead to an increase in crime, increased presence on the street of cyclists is likely to add to reassurance</p>

Improved junctions and/or traffic lights designs and phasing

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Meaningless cycle lane on Rotherhithe Street in already narrow road where buses find it difficult to turn.</p> <p>Streamline the bends from redriff/salter road to Rotherhithe Street by removing the absurd bend in the road and making it a cleaner right turn into Rotherhithe Street</p>	<p>The proposed layout is aimed at providing a continuous cycle route and give priority to the C10 bus route and give priority to the major flow, which is the northern section of Rotherhithe Street</p>
<p>In general, I support this but this is a very dangerous junction and I don't think you've properly looked at the problems with your solution here.</p> <p>If you remove the give way signs that are currently positioned at the end of Rotherhithe street, cars will whip round that corner so fast causing potential accidents with cars coming out of the other side of Rotherhithe Street and pedestrians / cyclists. At least the current give way lines force cases to stop and be a bit more careful.</p> <p>Re pedestrians, the zebra crossing inside Rotherhithe Street will help people going sting across the road but I think this design neglects people who are turning into Rotherhithe Street from Salter Road. Most pedestrians tend to cross on the bend where there is currently a give way sign on the floor, also highlight my point above as dangerous. You should consider moving the</p>	

<p>zebra crossing, or adding one on the bend, or keeping the current give way signs.</p> <p>Please go and stand there for a day and you will see exactly what I'm talking about.</p>	
<p>Please flip the ped crossing and the cycle crossing. Now you potentially have cycleway 4 users who will need to cross pedestrians waiting area, cross the street, and cross a pedestrian waiting area once again. Makes more sense to have the cycle crossing at the top and the ped crossing on the bottom.</p> <p>The crossing could be straight for cyclists to be honest, not sure why cyclists are forced to make slight turns in/out of Rotherhithe Street?</p>	<p>The determination of where the greater cycle flow exists so will more use Rotherhithe Street or Salter Road. As a result of the redesign of the junction the crossings have swapped</p>
<p>I think it's a little dangerous to assume that drivers will give way to bicycles while trying to cross the raised crossing - a signalized solution should be in place where it's always green for pedestrians and cycles and the signal turns green only after a car has waited at the crossing for one minute (this is already used worldwide with pressure sensors underneath the tarmac).</p>	<p>Initial designs for this location investigated traffic signals, roundabout and the layout consulted on, overall it was considered that a priority junction was most appropriate.</p>
<p>The pedestrian crossings need traffic light support because of the crossing of many school children - there is also more traffic at school time.</p>	
<p>We need traffic lights on the junction of Salter Rd and Rotherhithe Str.</p>	

<p>There's a busy school nearby (Redriff PLCA) and on the corner there's the Docklands Settlement with many activities for children and families. Salter street crossing is absolutely not safe because of the curve. Rotherhithe street's 'neck' is too wide to cross safely with all the turning traffic. There are buses on both roads.</p>	
<p>It's an overly complicated intersection for cyclists.</p>	<p>The points raised here are being reviewed as part of a redesign to take into account the concerns that have been raised. The concerns raised look to improve the design rather than challenge the principles of what is trying to be achieved</p>
<p>It looks like cars will come very fast into this junction and run over people cycling and walking on the zebra crossing! Could the junction be made tighter?</p>	
<p>Not great that the cycleway doesn't continue straight across the Rotherhithe Street junction here. Will it be clear enough to motorists to give way here to cyclists on the crossing?</p>	
<p>This looks particularly confusing for users of all modes of transport (motor vehicle, bicycles and pedestrians) as these road markings look confusing - particularly for people crossing the link road between Rotherhithe Street and Salter Road. There are potentially six lanes of traffic to cross - there are two two-way cyclelanes with a two way road in the middle. In addition, all cars and bicycles turning will be turning corners here, meaning that people will be at a high danger of being hit by either a car or bicycle turning inattentively.</p> <p>I also query whether this proposal will be effective - I feel that cyclists using Salter Road are more likely to come off their cycleway and cycle along the road</p>	

rather than turn a corner, wait to cross at a raised crossing and then turn again - this therefore increases the chances of a collision between cars and bicycles.

I see what you are trying to do here but I don't think it will work and it will frustrate cyclists. It would feel even more of a faff because you would have to bend round away from Salter Road, then back onto it, then cross over the road to get onto the other side. Cycle movement has to be kept as direct and simple as possible and this is the opposite of that. I would therefore keep the Cycleway along Salter Road with a priority over cars turning to/from Rotherhithe St. The pedestrian zebra crossing across Rotherhithe St would be in the same place as in the proposals.

For cyclists turning from Rotherhithe St onto Salter Road heading south (i.e. towards Surrey Quays shopping centre) there would be simple left turn which could be segregated from the main road. If they are turning right (i.e. heading they can just join the Cycleway and follow its priority along Salter Road).

For cyclists turning right or left from Salter Road onto Rotherhithe St you can keep the suggested cycle track, this would work well with my proposal to keep the Cycleway along Salter Rd, rather than jutting into Rotherhithe St then back out again.

The 90 degree turns look like they could be difficult for our cargo bikes to navigate. Would support swept path analysis that shows that these turns are possible for

<p>cargo and otherwise adapted cycles.</p> <p>The junction mouth for Rotherhithe Street is very wide which could encourage higher speed turns to be undertaken by motor vehicles</p>	
<p>Not great. Why is the turning radius for vehicles entering/leaving Rotherhithe Street left so wide? This encourages high-speed vehicle movements, directly approaching a pedestrian and cycle crossing. Also the order/positioning of the cycle and zebra crossings should be reversed on Rotherhithe Street. With the crossings in the order shown someone travelling on a bike North to South alongside SalterRoad would, in the space of a few metres, have to 1) Give way at a zebra crossing 2) Give way at another zebra crossing, 3) Give way to cyclists coming over the highway who are turning right 4) Cross the highway 5) Give way to cyclists coming from the left 6) Give way again at the other side of the same zebra crossing they'd just given way at! It's just too complex/cumbersome</p>	
<p>As again with cycle lane.</p> <p>I like the zebra crossing across salter rd.</p> <p>The one across the entrance To Rotherhithe street was abandoned in the past as a danger. Bus and cars turning into Rotherhithe street are not given any warning and may not see the crossing.</p>	
<p>Strongly support and it would be good for the junction</p>	

<p>to be squared up and junction mouth to be narrowed for motor traffic. This will help reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer.</p>	
<p>Reduce motor traffic speeds and make the crossing safer, by squaring up the junction mouth, and narrowing it for motor traffic.</p>	
<p>Good positioning of the loading bay. I don't agree with making cyclists turn the corner to go down the side street before crossing and turning back onto the main road. It will slow down cyclists and discourage them from using the cycleway. The cyclists should be given right of way over the junction.</p>	
<p>The Rotherhithe Street should be narrowed at the junction with Salter Road, drivers go too fast around the corner.</p> <p>Salter Road near Lavender Pond is not part of this consultation but it would a double-yellow line opposite would make it safer. Quite often cars parked on the left-hand bend</p> <p>force cyclists to move into the middle of the fast road. No surprise that Google</p> <p>Streetview captured one: https://goo.gl/maps/ZofoygWcJSd6fmau5</p>	
<p>junction to be squared up and junction mouth to be narrowed for motor traffic. This will help reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer.</p>	

<p>Please square up the junction and make the entry narrower for motor traffic. This will help reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer.</p>	
<p>Square up the junction. Also narrow the junction mouth for motor traffic. This will reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer.</p>	
<p>I support, but I would rather cyclists were able to carry on straight onto Salter road as they currently are</p>	
<p>the junction to be squared up and junction mouth to be narrowed for motor traffic. This will help reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer.</p>	
<p>To help reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer I would suggest squaring up the junction and narrowing its mouth for motor traffic</p>	
<p>narrow the road to slow down traffic</p>	
<p>maybe narrow the junction to slow motor traffic</p>	
<p>I strongly support changes to the junction between Rotherhithe St and Salter Rd. It is extremely difficult to cross the road here with children as traffic is coming from several directions and drivers are frequently driving too fast. There are lots of children crossing here due to proximity of the Docklands settlement community centre, Redriff school, Trinity nursery and Surrey Docks farm. Is it possible to narrow the car lanes of the junction and road to encourage car drivers to travel more slowly, as I frequently see drivers travelling too fast and turning too quickly at this junction.</p>	

<p>The crossing across salter road must be continuous, the current crossing island is very narrow and you cannot stand behind your pram on the island. Again cars frequently travel too fast here and there is a risk of young children stepping out in front of traffic rather than waiting on the island, I have seen several worrying near misses when children have not stopped on the island.</p>	
<p>It would be good to narrow the mouth of the junction to reduce traffic flow and speed, making it safer for cyclists.</p> <p>Good that there will be 2 new trees.</p>	
<p>junction to be squared up and junction mouth to be narrowed for motor traffic. This will help reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer.</p>	
<p>This is good, but is it possible to make the junction squarer and narrow the entrance? This should hopefully slow traffic speeds somewhat.</p>	
<p>The wide corner radius for motor traffic turning from Rotherhithe Street (south) onto Salter road means traffic may not be going slow enough to spot cycles coming from Rotherhithe Street (north) to Salter Road, which would have priority.</p> <p>I think a coloured surface treatment for the painted lane in front of the give way line is necessary here for this reason, so that drivers are aware that they need to</p>	

<p>slow down and look for vulnerable road users coming around the corner.</p> <p>The path for cyclists to join Rotherhithe Street from the proposed cycleway is also insufficient. After the zebra crossing, the cycle lane into Rotherhithe Street should continue parallel to the general traffic lane for a short distance so that cycle priority is maintained when merging with other traffic on Rotherhithe Street. The current arrangement makes priorities unclear for cycles in this position, especially with regard to motor traffic coming from Rotherhithe Street (south).</p> <p>I agree that segregated cycle lanes should not be necessary for Rotherhithe Street here but, Rotherhithe Street is not sufficiently traffic-calmed to make this section an easy, accessible ride at all times for less experienced cyclists or young children. I would like to see the implementation of modal filters along Rotherhithe Street so that resident access is maintained while preventing through traffic for all modes other than buses and cycles.</p>	
<p>We suggest asking for the junction to be squared up and junction mouth to be narrowed for motor traffic. This will help reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer.</p>	
<p>Zebra crossing immediately after turning into Rotherhithe Street is potentially hazardous.</p>	

<p>Unclear why tree needs to be removed on Salter Road at that location.</p>	
<p>The turn radius on the junction are too large. It should be squared up and made narrower to control traffic speeds.</p>	
<p>junction to be squared up and junction mouth to be narrowed for motor traffic. This will help reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer.</p>	
<p>We ask the junction be narrowed and squared up as much as possible. We are aware the local bus C10 needs some of the wider angles but those arms/directions not used by the bus should be square as possible to ensure motorists taking the turns do so as slowly as possible as this will reduce the risk to those in the cycle lane. As well as encouraging drivers to follow the designed intent and give way to the cyclelane and those on the crossing</p>	
<p>Please (a) square up the junction; and (b) narrow the mouth of the junction for motor traffic. This will help reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer.</p> <p>Also, let's have as few curbs as possible. Use tactile paving instead of curbs to demarcate the border between the road and the pavement. If you are going to put in curbs, then those curbs should be bevelled. Non-bevelled curbs are a extreme danger to cyclists. TfL has started bevelling the curbs on its cycle lanes. Please do the same. Thank you.</p>	
<p>We ask the junction be narrowed and squared up as</p>	

<p>much as possible. We are aware the local bus C10 needs some of the wider angles but those arms/directions not used by the bus should be square as possible to ensure motorists taking the turns do so as slowly as possible as this will reduce the risk to those in the cycle lane. As well as encouraging drivers to follow the designed intent and give way to the cyclelane and those on the crossing</p>	
<p>Please reflect on the arcs of the roads corners, and see if the junction can be squared up and junction mouth to be narrowed for motor traffic. This will help reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer.</p>	
<p>I suggest the junction to be squared up and junction mouth to be narrowed for motor traffic. This will help reduce traffic speeds and make the crossing safer.</p>	

Improved motor vehicles drivers/riders behaviours	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>tiger crossings need to be explained to motorists. motorists often think they have right of ways, which can create fatal conflicts.</p>	<p>Once works commence a public awareness programme will take place, explaining to local residents how the junction layout should be used together with the parallel crossings</p>

Improved public transport (reliability, more & direct routes, accessibility, overcrowding)

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Please seek alternatives to messing up a vital bus route</p> <p>Cyclists can be diverted along by the river .</p> <p>Redriff road is not the answer .</p> <p>You are encouraging cyclists onto the roads with the vehicles most likely to kill them . Side roads , parks and the riverfront are far safer .</p> <p>At the same time your proposals will negatively affect the bus routes, slowing down bus speeds . We have seen so many local routes be reduced in destination and frequency due to the slow traffic .</p> <p>Southwark's policy to keep putting cyclists onto major bus routes (Jamaica road in particular) is discriminatory against those elderly and disabled who rely on buses</p>	<p>There is not sufficient space to accommodate bus lay-bys, as a result of them being removed bus services are not expected to deteriorate, more likely they will not be delayed as they will be in the carriageway and not reliant on drivers allowing them to leave the lay-bys</p>
<p>Please refer previous comments.</p> <p>(Removal of bus lay bys will mean that traffic will be stopped as there will be inadequate room for passing. This will cause traffic delays.</p> <p>Cycle lane and width restrictions not required as no one will use it - there will not be a Rotherhithe</p>	

<p>Bridge.</p> <p>Don't forget that the road speed in this area is already restricted to 20 mph.)</p>	
<p>All the same reasons as stated before</p> <p>Also the removal of trees is terrible, the wording states only proposed replacement of them (Taking away bus lay bys and loss of grass verges is madness , the grass verges help to give the area character)</p>	
<p>There should be no reduction in motor vehicle carriageway width as a result of introducing a cycle track.</p> <p>There should be no loss of bus lay-bys</p>	
<p>There should be no loss of parking</p>	

More and safer cycle infrastructure/ routes	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Segregated cycling is essential here to improve safety and reduce air pollution</p>	
<p>segregated cycle lanes are essential for cycling with young children.</p>	
<p>I think its extremely important to segregate cycle lanes</p>	

<p>from the rest of traffic. I have been commuting by bicycle on this road for nearly ten years and I have lost count of the number of reckless impatient drivers (cars, vans, buses and taxis) that have nearly or actually knocked me off of my bicycle - the most dangerous road users in my opinion are generally the buses and taxis which share the current bus lanes with cyclists.</p>	
<p>Having a segregated lane will make it a lot safer, also positive 2 trees are replacing the 1 removed, more trees are a bonus.</p>	<p>Rotherhithe Street is used predominately by local traffic and is not considered to be taking rat-running traffic. So any filtered permeability would most likely not displace traffic. As Salter Road is the only alternative and is considered most likely to be a route traffic would choice to use.</p>
<p>As the Rotherhithe Street doesn't have any segregated tracks it would be nice to see some traffic reduction measures which ensure through traffic takes Salter Road instead of Rotherhithe Street</p>	
<p>The wide corner radius for motor traffic turning from Rotherhithe Street (south) onto Salter road means traffic may not be going slow enough to spot cycles coming from Rotherhithe Street (north) to Salter Road, which would have priority.</p> <p>I think a coloured surface treatment for the painted lane in front of the give way line is necessary here for this reason, so that drivers are aware that they need to slow down and look for vulnerable road users coming around the corner.</p> <p>The path for cyclists to join Rotherhithe Street from the proposed cycleway is also insufficient. After the zebra</p>	

<p>crossing, the cycle lane into Rotherhithe Street should continue parallel to the general traffic lane for a short distance so that cycle priority is maintained when merging with other traffic on Rotherhithe Street. The current arrangement makes priorities unclear for cycles in this position, especially with regard to motor traffic coming from Rotherhithe Street (south).</p> <p>I agree that segregated cycle lanes should not be necessary for Rotherhithe Street here but, Rotherhithe Street is not sufficiently traffic-calmed to make this section an easy, accessible ride at all times for less experienced cyclists or young children. I would like to see the implementation of modal filters along Rotherhithe Street so that resident access is maintained while preventing through traffic for all modes other than buses and cycles.</p>	
<p>more cycleways please</p>	

More enforcement	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>No need for a separated two way cycle track (and I am a cyclist and use the road every day). The road is already safe with very limited traffic and speed is limited at 20mph. You would better ensure the speed limit is respected.</p> <p>DO NOT remove grass verges.</p>	<p>Southwark to not have the powers to enforce speed limits; however our designs can influence drivers speeds. In this instance the narrowing of the carriageway width has been proved to reduce traffic speeds.</p>

No controlled parking	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Zebra crossings are in sensible positions</p> <p>No need for cycle lanes</p> <p>double yellow lanes can only be removed if sufficient parking is provided for parents using docklands settlements</p> <p>Do not remove trees. Best thing about Rotherhithe is all the trees.</p>	
<p>There should be no reduction in motor vehicle carriageway width as a result of introducing a cycle track.</p> <p>There should be no loss of bus lay-bys</p> <p>There should be no loss of parking</p>	

Other

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>THERE IS NO SPACE ON ROTHERHITHE STREET FOR A CYCLE LANE!!! USE THE LESS POPULATED SALTER ROAD!!</p> <p>Why would you unnecessarily disrupt hundreds of residents to build a cycle route for non residents??</p> <p>There is already a struggle with the buses and cars sharing the road, let alone the traffic. There is plenty of space on salter road for the cycle route IT DOES NOT NEED TO BE EXTENDED TO ROTHETHITHE STREET!!!</p> <p>Toute NCT425 can connect on salter road NOT ROTHERHITHE STREET!!</p> <p>Rotherhithe Street is a quiet residential road, it does not need to be disrupted when there is a larger emptier road like Salter Road running Parallel.</p> <p>ABSOLUTE IDIOT IDEA!!</p>	<p>There is no cycle lane proposed in Rotherhithe Street, the proposals for Rotherhithe Street are aimed at making it a more pleasant cycle whilst aiming to improve traffic flow, particularly for the C10 bus route</p>
<p>The Docklands Settlement generates a lot of short stay / drop off parking across from the bus stop. I don't think double yellow lines will prevent that causing a problem when a bus is stopped.</p>	<p>Double yellow line to not prevent pick-up or drop off of passengers, short stay parking is being investigated</p>

<p>Please seek alternatives to messing up a vital bus route</p> <p>Cyclists can be diverted along by the river .</p> <p>Redriff road is not the answer .</p> <p>You are encouraging cyclists onto the roads with the vehicles most likely to kill them . Side roads , parks and the riverfront are far safer .</p> <p>At the same time your proposals will negatively affect the bus routes, slowing down bus speeds . We have seen so many local routes be reduced in destination and frequency due to the slow traffic .</p> <p>Southwark's policy to keep putting cyclists onto major bus routes (Jamaica road in particular) is discriminatory against those elderly and disabled who rely on buses</p>	
<p>The cycle route should not enter Rotherhithe Street. There is no need to do so and there it is already a small road.</p>	
<p>Loss of bus lay-by is deleterious if there are not double yellow lines to prevent parking on Salter Road.</p>	<p>Double yellow lines are proposed</p>
<p>Disagree with tree removal and the new crossings. Unnecessary.</p>	

The roads are already narrow. Why create more problems with the so-called new layout?	The proposals control parking and make more space for moving vehicles
Stop prioritising cyclists at the expense of road users.	
I do not understand why the cycleway is on this side of Salter Rd, surely there would be less disruption if the cycleway continued down on the other side well away from the city farm and children, mums using this area during the day. I don't understand why the cycleway needs to go down Rotherhithe St at all.	There is no cycle lane proposed in Rotherhithe Street, the proposals for Rotherhithe Street are aimed at making it a more pleasant cycle whilst aiming to improve traffic flow, particularly for the C10 bus route
It is unclear what happens with the cycleway on Salter Road to the north of the Rotherhithe Street junction.	The cycle route ends here, we are investigating its extension
It is unclear what happens to the cycleway on the northern side of the Salter Road / Rotherhithe Street junction.	

Reduce road conflict between users	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
I'm very much in favour of anything that will reduce traffic speeds on these two roads (because of the amount of drivers who speed in this area). However I'm extremely worried that this may inadvertently lead to additional cycle traffic in the western end of Rotherhithe Street (an area not covered by these	

plans). We already have to dodge a fair number of bikes when walking along in this area.	
<p>1. Traffic signals will significantly slow down local buses in the area, which are already very slow and it takes a long while to get to the nearest tube/overground stations. This adds a lot to overall commute time.</p> <p>2. Rotherhithe Street is very narrow and it's really struggling with 2 way traffic at peak times. A cycle track will only make the situation worse.</p> <p>3. The increased number of cyclists in the area will make it less safe for walking, especially for children and parents with a buggy, it will also increase the amount of garbage on the streets and will likely lead to the increased crime rate too.</p>	<p>There is no cycle lane proposed in Rotherhithe Street, the proposals for Rotherhithe Street are aimed at making it a more pleasant cycle whilst aiming to improve traffic flow, particularly for the C10 bus route</p>

Reduced on street parking	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>The community centre and farm cause significant parking congestion and the double yellow lines while good need to cover the both sides of Rotherhithe Street as cars will move to try to park here and with the bus stop (with lay-bys removed) the road will be blocked as this section 19 moves to section 20 every time a bus stops</p>	<p>The double yellow lines will be reviewed as part of the detailed design for the controlled parking zone. We will also investigate implementing some short stay bays around this area.</p>

<p>I generally strongly support most of this proposal but need the change above</p>	
<p>Overall support - especially introduction of double yellow lines along this part of the route as parked traffic causes many issues. Slightly concerned about the loading bay location for docklands settlements as could cause issues for those loading into this space and clashes with cyclists</p>	
<p>Noting the tree is removed, can this be replaced by other planting.</p> <p>I strongly strongly strongly support the double yellow lines on one side of Rotherhite street. Cars on both sides of the road are currently a safety issue preventing emergency veichle access to Odessa Street and Elgar Street. These yellow lines should be added as a priority and should not be contingent on the other changes taking place.</p>	
<p>The Rotherhithe Street should be narrowed at the junction with Salter Road, drivers go too fast around the corner.</p> <p>Salter Road near Lavender Pond is not part of this consulation but it would a double-yellow line opposite would make it safer. Quite often cars parked on the left-hand bend</p> <p>force cyclists to move into the middle of the fast road. No surprise that Google</p>	<p>Jo Redshaw</p>

<p>Streetview captured one: https://goo.gl/maps/ZofoygWcJSd6fmau5</p>	
--	--

River crossings

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Please refer previous comments. (Removal of bus lay bys will mean that traffic will be stopped as there will be inadequate room for passing. This will cause traffic delays. Cycle lane and width restrictions not required as no one will use it - there will not be a Rotherhithe Bridge. Don't forget that the road speed in this area is already restricted to 20 mph.)</p>	

Segregated space for walking, cycling & driving

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I think its extremely important to segregate cycle lanes from the rest of traffic. I have been commuting by bicycle on this road for nearly ten years and I have lost count of the number of reckless impatient drivers (cars, vans, buses and taxis) that have nearly or actually knocked me off of my bicycle - the most dangerous road users in my opinion are generally the buses and taxis which share the current bus lanes with cyclists.</p>	

Segregation between cyclist and pedestrians


Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I oppose commingling cyclist crossing point with pedestrian zebra crossing. These two should be kept separate and a cyclist crossing should not have priority over cars driving on Salter Road / Redriff Road.</p> <p>I oppose pedestrian and cycle crossing on Rotherhithe street and cycle lane construct leading cyclists to te pavement on Rotherhithe street, as well as having priority over vehicles moving on Rotherhithe street.</p>	<p>The crossing is segregated with Cyclist and Pedestrians having their own allocated crossing point.</p> <p>Cyclist and pedestrians do not share space other than when they are required to cross cycleways or footways.</p> <p>Cyclists do not have priority over other road users on Rotherhithe Street</p>
<p>I strongly oppose the kerb on the segregated cycleway. This will make crossing the road with a pram very difficult.</p>	<p>New crossings have been proposed at regular intervals to allow pedestrians to cross Redriff Road and Salter Road</p>

Accessible for all

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>The 90 degree turns look like they could be difficult for our cargo bikes to navigate. Would support swept path analysis that shows that these turns are possible for cargo and otherwise adapted cycles.</p> <p>The junction mouth for Rotherhithe Street is very wide which could encourage higher speed turns to</p>	<p>This has been considered at our redesign and will be checked again at the detailed design stage</p>

be undertaken by motor vehicles	
I strongly oppose the kerb on the segregated cycleway. This will make crossing the road with a pram very difficult.	New crossings have been proposed at regular intervals to allow pedestrians to cross Redriff Road and Salter Road

Section 20. Rotherhithe Street (Bryan Road to Durand's Wharf)



Improve air quality	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Oh dear. More speed bumps!! Don't know why you need them, as the traffic by now will be completely gridlocked for days on end.</p> <p>My heart goes out to the poor animals inside Surrey Docks Farm who will almost certainly die from the increased air pollution, but are not even able to complain about the madness of all this. UTTERLY BONKERS!!!</p>	<p>The provision of safer cycle facilities will give people the opportunity to cycle rather than drive, which will assist in the improvement of air quality</p>

Do not agree with traffic calming/reduction and cycle lanes

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>1. We DO NOT NEED SPEED HUMPS!!!!</p> <p>2. Parking is already a problem for Residents on Rotherhithe Street, particularly on weekend when there are events at the Hilton, you are going to make it unbearable for residents, USE SALTER ROAD!!! NOT ROTHERHITHE STREET!!!</p>	<p>The proposed traffic calming measures being proposed are to encourage compliance with the 20mph speed limit and ensure that the speeds are appropriate for a route that is used by cyclist and pedestrians alike.</p>
<p>I have lived on Rotherhithe street for 15 years and traffic on the street is not a problem. There is also always parking available to find. Because of the twists on the road, it is difficult for drivers to speed and as the road is not a rat run and primarily only used by residents, it is not congested.</p> <p>Your proposals are not needed and a waste of taxpayers money. I personally don't park on the streets in Rotherhithe but your parking charge proposals are an opportunistic way to take more money from the hard working people of Rotherhithe. I feel for them as you squeeze more money out of the Southwark residents.</p> <p>Feel free to contact me and I can personally walk with you down Rotherhithe street and show you all the free parking spaces available, anytime of day. Call me on 0771 2870 802 to arrange a tour. Has</p>	<p>The road humps are designed to be bus friendly and suitable for the buses using this location.</p>

there been a study conducted? Have you actually visited Rotherhithe street or are you just taking the opportunity?

Oh dear. More speed bumps!! Don't know why you need them, as the traffic by now will be completely gridlocked for days on end.

My heart goes out to the poor animals inside Surrey Docks Farm who will almost certainly die from the increased air pollution, but are not even able to complain about the madness of all this. **UTTERLY BONKERS!!!**

Why are road humps needed in this area, on a bend where speeds will be much lower.

I support the introduction of parking restrictions all along Rotherhithe Street as the current situation with parking permitted on both sides in the same area has been unworkable for years and many representations to the area councillor have been ignored.

C10 buses are often unable to squeeze past cars on either side and when 2 buses arrive in the same area grid lock occurs.

I do not support speed humps as they make bus travel seriously uncomfortable ... if controlling speed is an issue then installing speed cameras is as effective without impairing comfortable

<p>travel for responsible drivers and bus passengers.</p> <p>Why is there a protruding pavement at the bus stop? ... these reduce the road's width and contribute nothing to embarking/alighting from the bus ... and they stop drainage with the result the road floods exaggerated in negative impact by utter failure by Southwark Council in clearing blocked gulleys.</p>	
<p>Extra flat top road humps unnecessary for this bend.</p>	
<p>Free parking near Surrey Docks Farm would be better. Road humps will make it difficult for buses to navigate.</p>	
<p>Humps are too densely placed and not needed.</p>	
<p>CPZ will be a problem, there are insufficient parking spaces now for residents.</p> <p>There are already traffic calming measures in place - these are detrimental to residents as buses and lorries pay no regard to the humps or speed restrictions and cause road vibrations which can be felt within residential properties.</p> <p>If anything the existing traffic calming measures should be removed.</p> <p>This may save the local council millions in</p>	

compensation payments for damage to residents property.	
Existing flat top road hump on Rotherhithe Street at this location is very poorly maintained, has sunk and introduction of more of them isn't welcome given the council's maintenance of the existing traffic calming measures.	
Not sure road humps are really needed.	
No bridge no need for route.. WHITE ELEPHANT.	The provision of safer cycle facilities will give people the opportunity to cycle rather than drive, which will assist in the improvement of air quality
This is very disruptive to the residents of Rotherhithe Street, we do not need a cycle lane on this narrow road, and the parking is already an issue when there is an event at the hotel.	

Easy and safe to cycle	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
sinusoidal humps should be used rather than flat ones	The choice of traffic calming used at this location takes into account all road users, as Rotherhithe Street is a bus route it is considered that the need of bus passengers needs to be taken into account. The height of the calming will be shallow so to minimise the effect on cyclists
Please use sinusoidal speed humps instead of flat tops. Sinusoidal humps are far safer and more comfortable to cycle over as they do not have such a steep rising angle as you come on to them, which can be painful and jarring to traverse with a bicycle. They also slow traffic more effectively as they have a sharper crest.	
This would be a very cheap way of further reducing	

road danger and increasing comfort when cycling.	
<p>I agree that segregated cycle lanes should not be necessary for Rotherhithe Street here but, Rotherhithe Street is not sufficiently traffic-calmed to make this section an easy, accessible ride at all times for less experienced cyclists or young children. I would like to see the implementation of modal filters along Rotherhithe Street so that resident access is maintained while preventing through traffic for all modes other than buses and cycles.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that humps with a sinusoidal profile which are easier to cycle over would be preferable, even if they incorporate a flat top. Also, the humps should not be made of paving stones or any other material which becomes difficult to ride over with age and wear. Perhaps they should be made of asphalt, so that the surface is more elastic and easy to repair.</p>	
here will be still too many cars using the road for me to feel confident cycling here. The road needs to have closures to stop rat running.	Rotherhithe Street is used predominately by local traffic and is not considered to be taking rat-running traffic. So any filtered permeability would most likely not displace traffic. As Salter Road is the only alternative and is considered most likely to be a route traffic would choice to use.
Not sure what benefit the paint on the road will present - there should either be a traffic filter somewhere or segregated lanes for cycles.	
As the Rotherhithe Street doesn't have any segregated tracks it would be nice to see some traffic reduction measures which ensure through	

<p>traffic takes Salter Road instead of Rotherhithe Street</p>	
<p>Painting bikes on the road does not make a safe cycle route. If people on bikes are to share the highway with other vehicles there needs to be a significant amount of filtered permeability. Traffic at low speed and low volume only. This scheme does not provide that.</p>	
<p>Please consider installing a bus gate or other filtering on Rotherhithe Street just north of Acorn Walk.</p>	
<p>I agree that segregated cycle lanes should not be necessary for Rotherhithe Street here but, Rotherhithe Street is not sufficiently traffic-calmed to make this section an easy, accessible ride at all times for less experienced cyclists or young children. I would like to see the implementation of modal filters along Rotherhithe Street so that resident access is maintained while preventing through traffic for all modes other than buses and cycles.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that humps with a sinusoidal profile which are easier to cycle over would be preferable, even if they incorporate a flat top. Also, the humps should not be made of paving stones or any other material which becomes difficult to ride over with age and wear. Perhaps they should be made of asphalt, so that the surface is more elastic</p>	

and easy to repair.	
make sure road is truly low-traffic, possibly introduce filtering or a moving bollard to restrict motor vehicle flows	
So far this is probably the least positive section for cyclists. It's hard to make out from the proposals but it seems like there will be still be cars double parked? Then when face with the C10 coming at you, it's a little bit ominous...	The design of this section of Rotherhithe Street has been designed to accommodate the competing uses for this location. The design attempts to cater for, buses, cyclists on-street parking, pedestrians and local traffic.
Parking restrictions are a good idea. But you need segregated cycling here too.	There is insufficient space to accommodate segregated facilities along Rotherhithe Street, the flows are considered low and the design has aimed to accommodate the competing road uses at this location
Not sure what benefit the paint on the road will present - there should either be a traffic filter somewhere or segregated lanes for cycles	
I strongly support calming measures and more restricted parking for cars. There is far too many cars parked on Rotherhithe Street as it is, I cycle there every day and I would welcome space designated for cyclists, if it was not for all those cars there would be space for this.	
Continue segregated route please.	
I think its extremely important to segregate cycle lanes from the rest of traffic. I have been commuting by bicycle on this road for nearly ten years and I have lost count of the number of reckless impatient drivers (cars, vans, buses and taxis) that have nearly or actually knocked me off of my bicycle - the most dangerous road users in	

<p>my opinion are generally the buses and taxis which share the current bus lanes with cyclists.</p>	
<p>The proposals do not solve the issues of cycling on Rotherhithe Street. Parking still takes up most of the space and there is little limitation to vehicle speed or dangerous overtaking. Cyclists will still have to stop to give way to vehicles. A design that brings physical constraints on motor traffic speed and overatking, such as the "fietsstrasse" (bike street) approach should be considered where bikes have priority over motor vehicles, including an irregular median to discourage overtaking. A few paint markings will not make much difference.</p>	<p>The flows are considered low and the design has aimed to accommodate the competing road uses at this location</p>
<p>more cycleways please</p>	
<p>INSERT NEW LAYOUT</p>	
<p>While I strongly support the proposals for the cycleway on Salter Road, in comparison the proposals for the cycle route on Rotherhithe Street are extremely disappointing.</p> <p>I am particularly concerned by the four sets of parking bays on the left--hand side of the road between the Surrey Docks Farm and Sandpiper Close.</p> <p>Underlying my concerns is the fact that a cyclist was killed on a Quietway in Islington last year when the driver of a van opened their door and the cyclist was thrown into the path of an oncoming taxi.</p>	<p>To provide a more defined alignment the kerb line at outside of Surrey Docks farm has been realigned to create an inset-parking bay</p>

Clearly, parking bays present an additional hazard to cyclists. In this case that hazard is combined with the bus stop in the middle of the for sets of bays, meaning that cyclists not only have to worry about car doors being opened in their path, cars overtaking them, but also have to worry about cars that are overtaking buses stopped at the bus stop.

I could understand is this area were short on parking spaces and the parking bays had to be accepted as a necessary evil, but the immediate area has ample off-street residents parking. I believe these four sets of parking bays should be removed as they are an unnecessary additional hazard on a narrow road.

I am less concerned about the inset bays after the entrance to Sandpiper Close.

We ask the council to look at the parking bays that are not inset and consider removing or reducing them. As when used they will cause a narrowing in the roadway that will mean people on bike and the bus will be forced into close proximity. This will impact the comfort and safety of those using the route and will discourage many of the people the council wishes to move to using active travel from doing so.

We ask the council to look at the parking bays that

are not inset and consider removing or reducing them. As when used they will cause a narrowing in the roadway that will mean people on bike and the bus will be forced into close proximity. This will impact the comfort and safety of those using the route and will discourage many of the people the council wishes to move to using active travel from doing so.	
These changes Traffic calming measures will reduce traffic speeds Control of parking will ensure sufficient space for cyclists will make it safe for cyclists.	

Enjoyable environment	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
More trees not less. If 15 are being felled 9 is not a replacement. Should be 45.	No trees are effected on this section, however, we are investigating if we can provide a new tree close to Surrey Docks Farm, where we propose to realign the kerb

Improved public transport (reliability, more & direct routes, accessibility, overcrowding)	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
I support the introduction of parking restrictions all along Rotherhithe Street as the current situation with parking permitted on both sides in the same area has been unworkable for years and many	The proposed positioning of the parking bays is to allowing gaps\parking places for buses and other road users. Bays and or bus stops are not proposed adjacent to each other. Double yellow

<p>representations to the area councillor have been ignored.</p> <p>C10 buses are often unable to squeeze past cars on either side and when 2 buses arrive in the same area grid lock occurs.</p> <p>I do not support speed humps as they make bus travel seriously uncomfortable ... if controlling speed is an issue then installing speed cameras is as effective without impairing comfortable travel for responsible drivers and bus passengers.</p> <p>Why is there a protruding pavement at the bus stop? ... these reduce the road's width and contribute nothing to embarking/alighting from the bus ... and they stop drainage with the result the road floods exaggerated in negative impact by utter failure by Southwark Council in clearing blocked gulleys.</p>	<p>are proposed along Rotherhithe Street, other than where bays are proposed</p>
<p>I live within sight of this section. This section needs double yellow lines on at least the one side. It is common occurrence for buses to get stuck and not able to get through.</p>	
<p>Free parking near Surrey Docks Farm would be better. Road humps will make it difficult for buses to navigate.</p>	
<p>Double yellow lines needed, with a small area near the farm for parking.</p>	

<p>Leading up to this area is a pinch point with C10 buses having trouble, passing. Add one lane open, because of buses stopped, cyclists and cars on the blind bend and there will be (are) accidents.</p>	
<p>Parking restrictions need to be enforced, at the moment there is hardly enough space for C10 buses to get through. Double yellows opposite the parking bays may help.</p>	
<p>Please install a barrier at the bottom of Holyoake footpath where it joins Salter Rd- children often scooter and cycle down this path after crossing the bridge from Redriff school, and can easily ride out into the road if they lose control of their speed or don't notice the road. Cars parked in the road reduce visibility for people crossing, will parking in the road be stopped? also the c10 bus is frequently delayed as the road becomes a single lane due to cars parking in the road. I would support ending all road parking as it has a detrimental effect on all road users, for the benefit of a few.</p>	

More and safer cycle infrastructure/ routes	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
more cycleways please	

More enforcement

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Parking restrictions need to be enforced, at the moment there is hardly enough space for C10 buses to get through. Double yellows opposite the parking bays may help.</p>	<p>Enforcement will be deployed as appropriate to the area</p>

No controlled parking

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I have lived on Rotherhithe street for 15 years and traffic on the street is not a problem. There is always parking available to find. Because of the twists on the road, it is difficult for drivers to speed and as the road is not a rat run and primarily only used by residents, it is not congested.</p> <p>Your proposals are not needed and a waste of taxpayers money. I personally don't park on the streets in Rotherhithe but your parking charge proposals are an opportunistic way to take more money from the hard working people of Rotherhithe. I feel for them as you squeeze more money out of the Southwark residents.</p> <p>Feel free to contact me and I can personally walk with you down Rotherhithe street and show you all</p>	<p>Controlled parking zones (CPZs) are the most effective way that the council can manage kerbside space. If all new developments had enough parking for all residents, traffic in the area would increase as would air pollution. Southwark Council's Movement Plan encourages more sustainable modes of travel.</p> <p>Controlled parking zones are effective at reducing the amount of cars parked in an area. We rarely receive complaints from those living in a CPZ that they cannot find a space to park</p>

<p>the free parking spaces available, anytime of day. Call me on 0771 2870 802 to arrange a tour. Has there been a study conducted? Have you actually visited Rotherhithe street or are you just taking the opportunity?</p>	
<p>CPZ will be a problem, there are insufficient parking spaces now for residents.</p> <p>There are already traffic calming measures in place - these are detrimental to residents as buses and lorries pay no regard to the humps or speed restrictions and cause road vibrations which can be felt within residential properties.</p> <p>If anything the existing traffic calming measures should be removed.</p> <p>This may save the local council millions in compensation payments for damage to residents property.</p>	
<p>Cpz is another cost for local residents, that is going to make life harder</p>	
<p>There should be no introduction of CPZ</p>	
<p>I support the humps but not the controlled parking.</p> <p>Shops are very hard to come by in the Docklands so the introduction on the Coop on this road is very handy but it's still too far to walk for a lot of people so we are forced to drive and need to be able to</p>	<p>Jo Redshaw</p>

park freely on this road in order to go shopping.	
Free parking near Surrey Docks Farm would be better. Road humps will make it difficult for buses to navigate.	We will also investigate implementing some short stay bays around this area.

Noise reduction	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>CPZ will be a problem, there are insufficient parking spaces now for residents.</p> <p>There are already traffic calming measures in place - these are detrimental to residents as buses and lorries pay no regard to the humps or speed restrictions and cause road vibrations which can be felt within residential properties.</p> <p>If anything the existing traffic calming measures should be removed.</p> <p>This may save the local council millions in compensation payments for damage to residents property.</p>	<p>The noise that can be created by traffic calming measure is airborne and does not cause damage to properties. The traffic calming proposed at this location is low in height and should not cause noise vibration.</p>

Other	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>There may be a requirement for another raised hump between Hollyoake footpath and the sharp bend in Rotherhithe street. As a resident in the flats</p>	<p>Following feed back it is proposed to realign the bend, which should further reduce speeds</p>

<p>overlooking this section, I see how many cars really speed down this section once they have cleared the corner/or approaching the corner. the proposed/existing humps don't look enough to prevent this.</p>	
<p>I support the humps but not the controlled parking.</p> <p>Shops are very hard to come by in the Docklands so the introduction on the Coop on this road is very handy but it's still too far to walk for a lot of people so we are forced to drive and need to be able to park freely on this road in order to go shopping.</p>	
<p>1. We DO NOT NEED SPEED HUMPS!!!!</p> <p>2. Parking is already a problem for Residents on Rotherhithe Street, particularly on weekend when there are events at the Hilton, you are going to make it unbearable for residents, USE SALTER ROAD!!! NOT ROTHERHITHE STREET!!!</p>	
<p>This is very disruptive to the residents of Rotherhithe Street, we do not need a cycle lane on this narrow road, and the parking is already an issue when there is an event at the hotel.</p>	
<p>Not sure if so much parking + cars + cyclists + busses is going to work.</p>	
<p>These changes are sorely needed</p>	
<p>People are already restricted in so many ways from no parking/one way to not being able to park</p>	

No great advantage here	
Strongly support the use of traffic calming on this road	
Because of the lower number of parking spots some bike racks would be needed for all the people who come to Surrey Docks Farm	Locations for cycle parking will be investigated at the next stage
Holyoake Footpath needs railing to help children to see to stop before the road when they are coming from the footbridge (from Redriff Primary School). The Footpath is totally covered between the buildings and fences, so it's a blind spot, where children are coming on bike with high speed, without realising there is a road.	The existing road hump is to be removed and replaced. The new road hump should be more effective in reducing traffic speeds
We need a railing on the Holyoake Footpath, where it meets Rotherhithe Road. The footpath comes down between buildings and fences, from the footbridge at Redriff School. it's pretty scary to see kids from the nearby school on bikes rushing down absolutely unseen from the road. It's absolutely not obvious that there's a road, as the path continues to the Thames Path on the other side.	
Please install a barrier at the bottom of Holyoake footpath where it joins Salter Rd- children often scooter and cycle down this path after crossing the bridge from Redriff school, and can easily ride out into the road if they lose control of their speed or don't notice the road. Cars parked in the road reduce visibility for people crossing, will parking in the road be stopped? also the c10 bus is frequently	

<p>delayed as the road becomes a single lane due to cars parking in the road. I would support ending all road parking as it has a detrimental effect on all road users, for the benefit of a few.</p>	
<p>Let's have as few curbs as possible. Use tactile paving instead of curbs to demarcate the border between the road and the pavement. If you are going to put in curbs, then those curbs should be bevelled. Non-bevelled curbs are a extreme danger to cyclists. TfL has started bevelling the curbs on its cycle lanes. Please do the same. Thank you.</p>	<p>Bevelled kerbs will be used in the new design</p>

Promote local economy	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I support the humps but not the controlled parking.</p> <p>Shops are very hard to come by in the Docklands so the introduction on the Coop on this road is very handy but it's still too far to walk for a lot of people so we are forced to drive and need to be able to park freely on this road in order to go shopping.</p>	<p>Jo Redshaw</p>
<p>Very much in favour of reducing the parking along rotherhithe street, especially in this stretch but the plan only accommodates what looks like less than 50% of the current availability. Where are people going to park? This is going to result in heavier parking in the side streets, simply pushing the issue</p>	<p>We will also investigate implementing some short stay bays around the farm.</p>

<p>further down the road.</p> <p>Also concerns over parking provision for the farm - this could seriously detriment their business which is core feature of Rotherhihe street - what parking provision is being created elsewhere to support this vital community resource?</p>	
<p>It is important to provide done short stay and pay places to enable businesses to continue and to enable Southwark residents to enjoy the river front</p> <p>Don't make the river walks the door preserve of the rich who can live there</p>	<p>Jo Redshaw</p>
<p>Double yellow lines needed, with a small area near the farm for parking.</p> <p>Leading up to this area is a pinch point with C10 buses having trouble, passing. Add one lane open, because of buses stopped, cyclists and cars on the blind bend and there will be (are) accidents.</p>	<p>We will also investigate implementing some short stay bays around the farm</p>

Reduced on street parking	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>You need double yellows on all of Rotherhithe Street. The farm causes massive congestion already and the new community centre on Salter Rd now causes overflow parking as well</p>	<p>Double yellow lines are proposed on Rotherhithe Street</p>

I support the introduction of parking restrictions all along Rotherhithe Street as the current situation with parking permitted on both sides in the same area has been unworkable for years and many representations to the area councillor have been ignored.

C10 buses are often unable to squeeze past cars on either side and when 2 buses arrive in the same area grid lock occurs.

I do not support speed humps as they make bus travel seriously uncomfortable ... if controlling speed is an issue then installing speed cameras is as effective without impairing comfortable travel for responsible drivers and bus passengers.

Why is there a protruding pavement at the bus stop? ... these reduce the road's width and contribute nothing to embarking/alighting from the bus ... and they stop drainage with the result the road floods exaggerated in negative impact by utter failure by Southwark Council in clearing blocked gulleys.

I live within sight of this section. This section needs double yellow lines on at least the one side. It is common occurrence for buses to get stuck and not able to get through.

Parking restrictions need to be enforced, at the

<p>moment there is hardly enough space for C10 buses to get through. Double yellows opposite the parking bays may help.</p>	
<p>These changes Traffic calming measures will reduce traffic speeds</p> <p>Control of parking will ensure sufficient space for cyclists will make it safe for cyclists.</p>	
<p>Parking restrictions are a good idea. But you need segregated cycling here too.</p>	
<p>I strongly support calming measures and more restricted parking for cars. There is far too many cars parked on Rotherhithe Street as it is, I cycle there every day and I would welcome space designated for cyclists, if it was not for all those cars there would be space for this.</p>	
<p>Very much in favour of reducing the parking along rotherhithe street, especially in this stretch but the plan only accommodates what looks like less than 50% of the current availability. Where are people going to park? This is going to result in heavier parking in the side streets, simply pushing the issue further down the road.</p> <p>Also concerns over parking provision for the farm - this could seriously detriment their business which is core feature of Rotherhihe street - what parking provision is being created elsewhere to support this vital community resource?</p>	<p>Controlled parking zones (CPZs) are the most effective way that the council can manage kerbside space. If all new developments had enough parking for all residents, traffic in the area would increase as would air pollution. Southwark Council's Movement Plan encourages more sustainable modes of travel.</p> <p>Controlled parking zones are effective at reducing the amount of cars parked in an area. We rarely receive complaints from those living in a CPZ that they cannot find a space to park</p>

<p>Double yellow lines needed, with a small area near the farm for parking.</p> <p>Leading up to this area is a pinch point with C10 buses having trouble, passing. Add one lane open, because of buses stopped, cyclists and cars on the blind bend and there will be (are) accidents.</p>	
<p>I'm broadly in favour of this, but very concerned that by introducing controlled parking zones at this end of Rotherhithe Street but not at the western end (nearest the Rotherhithe Tunnel), it will simply cause a massive parking problem there. The situation is already very bad. Apologies if I have missed something, but this doesn't appear to have been addressed. (If the CPZ will cover the whole of Rotherhithe Street, please ignore this comment.)</p>	<p>CPZ will cover all of Rotherhithe Street</p>
<p>Please install a barrier at the bottom of Holyoake footpath where it joins Salter Rd- children often scooter and cycle down this path after crossing the bridge from Redriff school, and can easily ride out into the road if they lose control of their speed or don't notice the road. Cars parked in the road reduce visibility for people crossing, will parking in the road be stopped? also the c10 bus is frequently delayed as the road becomes a single lane due to cars parking in the road. I would support ending all road parking as it has a detrimental effect on all road users, for the benefit of a few.</p>	<p>Double yellow lines are proposed other than where bays are shown so parking will be reduced\better controlled</p>

Remove speed humps

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>CPZ will be a problem, there are insufficient parking spaces now for residents.</p> <p>There are already traffic calming measures in place - these are detrimental to residents as buses and lorries pay no regard to the humps or speed restrictions and cause road vibrations which can be felt within residential properties.</p> <p>If anything the existing traffic calming measures should be removed.</p> <p>This may save the local council millions in compensation payments for damage to residents property</p>	

River crossings

Comments and or suggestions	Response
No bridge no need for route.. WHITE ELEPHANT.	

Road maintenance


Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I support the introduction of parking restrictions all along Rotherhithe Street as the current situation with parking permitted on both sides in the same area has been unworkable for years and many representations to the area councillor have been ignored.</p> <p>C10 buses are often unable to squeeze past cars on either side and when 2 buses arrive in the same area grid lock occurs.</p> <p>I do not support speed humps as they make bus travel seriously uncomfortable ... if controlling speed is an issue then installing speed cameras is as effective without impairing comfortable travel for responsible drivers and bus passengers.</p> <p>Why is there a protruding pavement at the bus stop? ... these reduce the road's width and contribute nothing to embarking/alighting from the bus ... and they stop drainage with the result the road floods exaggerated in negative impact by utter failure by Southwark Council in clearing blocked gulleys.</p>	<p>Blocked gulleys will be investigated when the road is resurfaced</p>
Existing flat top road hump next to hollyoake	This road hump is to be replaced with a asphalt

footpath will need resurfacing / rebuilding	hump, reducing the maintenance liability \ issues of the existing hump
---	--

Safer speeds	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Painting bikes on the road does not make a safe cycle route. If people on bikes are to share the highway with other vehicles there needs to be a significant amount of filtered permeability. Traffic at low speed and low volume only. This scheme does not provide that.	Rotherhithe Street is used predominately by local traffic and is not considered to be taking rat-running traffic. As Salter Road is the only road alternative and is considered most likely to be a route traffic would choice to use, which will help to keep traffic volumes low. The position of traffic calming features should ensure reduced speeds

Safety	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Double yellow lines needed, with a small area near the farm for parking. Leading up to this area is a pinch point with C10 buses having trouble, passing. Add one lane open, because of buses stopped, cyclists and cars on the blind bend and there will be (are) accidents.	The kerb is being realigned at this point together with new road humps which will help reduced the speed of vehicles
I find parking by the side of the road a danger to cyclists. Eg car doors opening cyclist swerving into line of traffic and injured as a result.	To mitigate against this we have only provided parking bays on one side of the road, which on this section provide between 5.3 and 7.4 metres

Section 21. Rotherhithe Street (Durand's Wharf to Silver Walk)



Improve air quality	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I OPPOSE HAVING ANY HUMPS OUTSIDE OF MY HOUSE!! ABSOLUTELY NOT!!</p> <p>PARKING IS ALREADY RIDICULOUS ON THE WEEKEND, THERE IS NO NEED FOR SPEED BUMPS, THEY INCREASE TRAFFIC POLLUTION BY DRIVERS EXELLERATING AND BRAKING!</p> <p>The buses already shake out houses let alone any further plans to shake the whole street.</p> <p>USE SALTER ROAD!!!</p>	<p>The provision of safer cycle facilities will give people the opportunity to cycle rather than drive, which will assist in the improvement of air quality</p>

Do not agree with traffic calming/reduction and cycle lanes

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I OPPOSE HAVING ANY HUMPS OUTSIDE OF MY HOUSE!! ABSOLUTELY NOT!!</p> <p>PARKING IS ALREADY RIDICULOUS ON THE WEEKEND, THERE IS NO NEED FOR SPEED BUMPS, THEY INCREASE TRAFFIC POLLUTION BY DRIVERS EXELLERATING AND BRAKING!</p> <p>The buses already shake out houses let alone any further plans to shake the whole street.</p> <p>USE SALTER ROAD!!!</p>	<p>There are two new proposed road humps in this section, overall seven new humps are proposed and there is one existing hump. The flat top humps have been chosen as Rotherhithe Street is a bus route. The humps have been positioned around key locations and where possible an even spacing to minimise acceleration and braking</p>
<p>How mad can this scheme get? Yet more unnecessary speed bumps, AND parking restrictions. Where are the residents of Rotherhithe Street supposed to park their cars then?</p>	
<p>Excessive use of speed humps which are not needed on these roads.</p>	
<p>I support the introduction of parking restrictions all along Rotherhithe Street as the current situation with parking permitted on both sides in the same area has been unworkable for years and many representations to the area councillor have been ignored.</p>	

<p>C10 buses are often unable to squeeze past cars on either side and when 2 buses arrive in the same area grid lock occurs.</p> <p>I do not support speed humps as they make bus travel seriously uncomfortable ... if controlling speed is an issue then installing speed cameras is as effective without impairing comfortable travel for responsible drivers and bus passengers.</p>	
<p>No need for more flat top road humps.</p>	
<p>Humps are too densely placed and not needed.</p>	
<p>See previous comments.</p> <p>(CPZ will be a problem, there are insufficient parking spaces now for residents.</p> <p>There are already traffic calming measures in place - these are detrimental to residents as buses and lorries pay no regard to the humps or speed restrictions and cause road vibrations which can be felt within residential properties.</p> <p>If anything the existing traffic calming measures should be removed.</p> <p>This may save the local council millions in compensation payments for damage to residents property.)</p>	
<p>Not sure road humps are really needed.</p>	
<p>No road humps: they're bad for cyclists and the</p>	

disabled	
----------	--

Easy and safe to cycle	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Choice of traffic calming	
<p>sinusoidal humps should be used rather than flat humps</p> <p>Fully support the double yellow lines here. This section is always the narrowest on the whole of Rotherhithe Street and has speeding traffic in the narrow carriageway between rows of parked cars. By removing the parking, there is more space to allow cyclists to safely pass oncoming traffic.</p> <p>However, please use sinusoidal speed bumps instead of flat tops, as they slow down vehicles more effectively and are also more comfortable to cycle across.</p>	<p>The choice of traffic calming used at this location takes into account all road users, as Rotherhithe Street is a bus route it is considered that the need of bus passengers needs to be taken into account.</p> <p>The height of the calming will be shallow so to minimise the effect on cyclists</p>
Filtered Permeability	
<p>Again, this isn't really making things much better for bikes. There will still be too many cars using it as through route/rat running. Really needs to be closed to through traffic</p> <p>As the Rotherhithe Street doesn't have any segregated tracks it would be nice to see some traffic reduction measures which ensure through traffic takes Salter Road instead of Rotherhithe</p>	<p>Rotherhithe Street is used predominately by local traffic and is not considered to be taking rat-running traffic. So any filtered permeability would most likely not displace traffic. As Salter Road is the only road alternative and is considered most likely to be a route traffic would choice to use.</p>

Street	
<p>Painting bikes on the road does not make a safe cycle route. If people on bikes are to share the highway with other vehicles there needs to be a significant amount of filtered permeability. Traffic at low speed and low volume only. This scheme does not provide that.</p>	
<p>I agree that segregated cycle lanes should not be necessary for Rotherhithe Street here but, Rotherhithe Street is not sufficiently traffic-calmed to make this section an easy, accessible ride at all times for less experienced cyclists or young children. I would like to see the implementation of modal filters along Rotherhithe Street so that resident access is maintained while preventing through traffic for all modes other than buses and cycles.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that humps with a sinusoidal profile which are easier to cycle over would be preferable, even if they incorporate a flat top. Also, the humps should not be made of paving stones or any other material which becomes difficult to ride over with age and wear. Perhaps they should be made of asphalt, so that the surface is more elastic and easy to repair.</p> <p>An easy cycle connection ought to be provided to Holyoake Footpath in both directions away from Rotherhithe Street, as it will provide a safe and</p>	

<p>easy connection to the housing and amenities at Downtown Road. The current way to reach it is via Salter Way, which is very dangerous and scary for less experienced cyclists, given high traffic speeds, wide road and no dedicated space for cycling. An alternative route is necessary here.</p>	
<p>make sure road is truly low-traffic, possibly introduce filtering or a moving bollard to restrict motor vehicle flows</p>	
<p>Better cycling facilities</p>	
<p>Parking restrictions are a good idea - but you need segregated cycling here too.</p>	<p>There is insufficient space to accommodate segregated facilities along Rotherhithe Street, the flows are considered low and the design has aimed to accommodate the competing road uses at this location</p>
<p>please create segregated cycle track.</p>	
<p>The proposals do not solve the issues of cycling on Rotherhithe Street. Parking still takes up most of the space and there is little limitation to vehicle speed or dangerous overtaking. Cyclists will still have to stop to give way to vehicles. A design that brings physical constraints on motor traffic speed and overatking, such as the "fietsstrasse" (bike street) approach should be considered where bikes have priority over motor vehicles, including an irregular median to discourage overtaking. A few paint markings will not make much difference.</p>	
<p>Parking Bays</p>	
<p>Please see my comments on the previous section. I believe that the two sets of parking bays on the left-hand side of the road (ie before the 2nd flat-top</p>	<p>Whilst some properties do have off street parking not all properties do some on street parking is still</p>

<p>hump) are an additional hazard to cyclists that is unnecessary because the area has plenty of off-street residents parking.</p> <p>(Double yellow lines needed, with a small area near the farm for parking.</p> <p>Leading up to this area is a pinch point with C10 buses having trouble, passing. Add one lane open, because of buses stopped, cyclists and cars on the blind bend and there will be (are) accidents.)</p>	<p>required</p>
<p>We ask the council to look at the parking bays that are not inset and consider removing or reducing them. As when used they will cause a narrowing in the roadway that will mean people on bike and the bus will be forced into close proximity. This will impact the comfort and safety of those using the route and will discourage many of the people the council wishes to move to using active travel from doing so.</p>	
<p>These changes Traffic calming measures will reduce traffic speeds</p> <p>Control of parking will ensure sufficient space for cyclists will make it safe for cyclists.</p>	
<p>Let's have as few curbs as possible. Use tactile paving instead of curbs to demarcate the border between the road and the pavement. If you are</p>	<p>Bevelled kerbs are to be used</p>

going to put in curbs, then those curbs should be bevelled. Non-bevelled curbs are a extreme danger to cyclists. TfL has started bevelling the curbs on its cycle lanes. Please do the same. Thank you.	
---	--

Filtered/closed/pedestrianised roads and stop rat runs	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Again, this isn't really making things much better for bikes. There will still be too many cars using it as through route/rat running. Really needs to be closed to through traffic	Rotherhithe Street is used predominately by local traffic and is not considered to be taking rat-running traffic. So any filtered permeability would most likely not displace traffic. As Salter Road is the only road alternative and is considered most likely to be a route traffic would choice to use
As the Rotherhithe Street doesn't have any segregated tracks it would be nice to see some traffic reduction measures which ensure through traffic takes Salter Road instead of Rotherhithe Street	
Painting bikes on the road does not make a safe cycle route. If people on bikes are to share the highway with other vehicles there needs to be a significant amount of filtered permeability. Traffic at low speed and low volume only. This scheme does not provide that.	
I agree that segregated cycle lanes should not be necessary for Rotherhithe Street here but, Rotherhithe Street is not sufficiently traffic-calmed to make this section an easy, accessible ride at all times for less experienced cyclists or young	

children. I would like to see the implementation of modal filters along Rotherhithe Street so that resident access is maintained while preventing through traffic for all modes other than buses and cycles.

It is also worth noting that humps with a sinusoidal profile which are easier to cycle over would be preferable, even if they incorporate a flat top. Also, the humps should not be made of paving stones or any other material which becomes difficult to ride over with age and wear. Perhaps they should be made of asphalt, so that the surface is more elastic and easy to repair.

An easy cycle connection ought to be provided to Holyoake Footpath in both directions away from Rotherhithe Street, as it will provide a safe and easy connection to the housing and amenities at Downtown Road. The current way to reach it is via Salter Way, which is very dangerous and scary for less experienced cyclists, given high traffic speeds, wide road and no dedicated space for cycling. An alternative route is necessary here.

make sure road is truly low-traffic, possibly introduce filtering or a moving bollard to restrict motor vehicle flows

Enjoyable environment	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
More trees not less. If 15 are being felled 9 is not a replacement. Should be 45.	No trees are affected within this section, however, with the designs developed to date we have taken great care to minimise the loss of trees. At the next design stage we will continue this and investigate opportunities to plant additional trees
Not sure what improvement this is offering cycles of pedestrians. A lot of info to take in. But surely if you are hoping for more people to cycle and walk, then you should have more trees!!	

Improved public transport (reliability, more & direct routes, accessibility, overcrowding)	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I support the introduction of parking restrictions all along Rotherhithe Street as the current situation with parking permitted on both sides in the same area has been unworkable for years and many representations to the area councillor have been ignored.</p> <p>C10 buses are often unable to squeeze past cars on either side and when 2 buses arrive in the same area grid lock occurs.</p> <p>I do not support speed humps as they make bus travel seriously uncomfortable ... if controlling speed is an issue then installing speed cameras is as effective without impairing comfortable</p>	Flat top humps have been chosen as they are more acceptable on bus routes.

travel for responsible drivers and bus passengers.	
Support double yellow lines. Needed to allow buses to be able to get through.	
Double yellows are a positive move. Parking on both sides is a particular issue for bus and lorry traffic especially when wide vans are parked. It does beg the question as to what provision is being made for the cars / vans displaced from the road?	
the c10 bus gets frequently delayed due to the road being single lane as people park in the street, i would strongly support ending all street parking in this area. perhaps the Hilton could rent car parking spaces in their large car park to the public.	

More and safer cycle infrastructure/ routes	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Rotherhithe street needs a bike lane. Cars are extremely aggressive. I've had them close pass and accelerate towards me when there is insufficient room due to double parked cars.	There is insufficient space to accommodate segregated facilities or a cycle lane along Rotherhithe Street, the flows are considered low and the design has aimed to accommodate the competing road uses at this location
Parking restrictions are a good idea - but you need segregated cycling here too.	
Surely some sort of dedicated cycle route should continue (although I can see there is limited space). This becomes as issue for the cyclist who is thrown	

<p>to fight for their space on the road after the safety of a dedicated space.</p>	
<p>please create segregated cycle track.</p>	
<p>Again, this isn't really making things much better for bikes. There will still be too many cars using it as through route/rat running. Really needs to be closed to through traffic</p>	<p>Rotherhithe Street is used predominately by local traffic and is not considered to be taking rat-running traffic. So any filtered permeability would most likely not displace traffic. As Salter Road is the only alternative and is considered most likely to be a route traffic would choice to use</p>
<p>As the Rotherhithe Street doesn't have any segregated tracks it would be nice to see some traffic reduction measures which ensure through traffic takes Salter Road instead of Rotherhithe Street</p>	
<p>Painting bikes on the road does not make a safe cycle route. If people on bikes are to share the highway with other vehicles there needs to be a significant amount of filtered permeability. Traffic at low speed and low volume only. This scheme does not provide that.</p>	
<p>I agree that segregated cycle lanes should not be necessary for Rotherhithe Street here but, Rotherhithe Street is not sufficiently traffic-calmed to make this section an easy, accessible ride at all times for less experienced cyclists or young children. I would like to see the implementation of modal filters along Rotherhithe Street so that resident access is maintained while preventing through traffic for all modes other than buses and cycles.</p>	

<p>It is also worth noting that humps with a sinusoidal profile which are easier to cycle over would be preferable, even if they incorporate a flat top. Also, the humps should not be made of paving stones or any other material which becomes difficult to ride over with age and wear. Perhaps they should be made of asphalt, so that the surface is more elastic and easy to repair.</p> <p>An easy cycle connection ought to be provided to Holyoake Footpath in both directions away from Rotherhithe Street, as it will provide a safe and easy connection to the housing and amenities at Downtown Road. The current way to reach it is via Salter Way, which is very dangerous and scary for less experienced cyclists, given high traffic speeds, wide road and no dedicated space for cycling. An alternative route is necessary here.</p>	
<p>make sure road is truly low-traffic, possibly introduce filtering or a moving bollard to restrict motor vehicle flows</p>	
<p>The proposals do not solve the issues of cycling on Rotherhithe Street. Parking still takes up most of the space and there is little limitation to vehicle speed or dangerous overtaking. Cyclists will still have to stop to give way to vehicles. A design that brings physical constraints on motor traffic speed and overatking, such as the "fietsstrasse" (bike street) approach should be considered where bikes have priority over motor vehicles, including an</p>	

irregular median to discourage overtaking. A few paint markings will not make much difference.	
more cycleways please	
These changes Traffic calming measures will reduce traffic speeds Control of parking will ensure sufficient space for cyclists will make it safe for cyclists.	

No controlled parking	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I support the humps but not the controlled parking.</p> <p>Shops are very hard to come by in the Docklands so the introduction on the Coop on this road is very handy but it's still too far to walk for a lot of people so we are forced to drive and need to be able to park freely on this road in order to go shopping.</p> <p>The introduction of cpz is awful</p> <p>Making it more expensive for the local people to live here .</p> <p>Even though im sure there will be a comment stating residents will have a reduced fee , its still another cost</p> <p>There should be no introduction of CPZ</p>	<p>Jo Redshaw</p>

<p>How mad can this scheme get? Yet more unnecessary speed bumps, AND parking restrictions. Where are the residents of Rotherhithe Street supposed to park their cars then?</p>	<p>Controlled parking zones (CPZs) are the most effective way that the council can manage kerbside space. If all new developments had enough parking for all residents, traffic in the area would increase as would air pollution. Southwark Council's Movement Plan encourages more sustainable modes of travel</p>
<p>Where will all the residents of Rotherhithe Street park? These bays will not be sufficient.</p> <p>Reduce double yellow lines</p>	
<p>See previous comments.</p> <p>(CPZ will be a problem, there are insufficient parking spaces now for residents.</p> <p>There are already traffic calming measures in place - these are detrimental to residents as buses and lorries pay no regard to the humps or speed restrictions and cause road vibrations which can be felt within residential properties.</p> <p>If anything the existing traffic calming measures should be removed.</p> <p>This may save the local council millions in compensation payments for damage to residents property.)</p>	
<p>Double yellow lines without any additional spaces for residents will displace cars elsewhere.</p> <p>Not clear how buses and cars will be able to pass in</p>	

the constrained highway.	
Residents should not have to be disrupted by either paying for their own, or their visitors parking. It is not fair on the residents to have to have a new bill to benefit passers by.(Cyclists)	The CPZ is not being introduced as a result of the Cycleway.

Noise reduction	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>See previous comments. (CPZ will be a problem, there are insufficient parking spaces now for residents.</p> <p>There are already traffic calming measures in place - these are detrimental to residents as buses and lorries pay no regard to the humps or speed restrictions and cause road vibrations which can be felt within residential properties.</p> <p>If anything the existing traffic calming measures should be removed.</p> <p>This may save the local council millions in compensation payments for damage to residents property.)</p>	<p>The noise that can be created by traffic calming measure is airborne and does not cause damage to properties. The traffic calming proposed at this location is low in height and should not cause noise vibration.</p>

Other	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Only one new flat top road New double yellow hump is enough.	The proposed humps are evenly placed to allow drivers to approach driver at a constant speed to reduce braking and acceleration
Lives were saved before these new cycle lanes that are claiming more lives	
No great advantage to this	

Promote local economy	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I support the humps but not the controlled parking.</p> <p>Shops are very hard to come by in the Docklands so the introduction on the Coop on this road is very handy but it's still too far to walk for a lot of people so we are forced to drive and need to be able to park freely on this road in order to go shopping.</p> <p>It is important to provide some short stay or pay parking to enable local business to continue and for Southwark residents to be able to enjoy the river</p>	Jo Redshaw

Reduced on street parking

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Here you have the double yellows right and are not causing any bus congestion by removing laybys</p>	
<p>The alternate double yellow lines make this a more appealing layout for cyclist so that cars aren't double parked</p>	
<p>Parking restrictions are a good idea - but you need segregated cycling here too.</p>	
<p>Same comments as before - very keen to see controlled parking and double yellow lines along RS, but very concerned that the current volume of parked traffic is not being considered. Where are all of these residents going to park?</p>	
<p>Fully support the double yellow lines here. This section is always the narrowest on the whole of Rotherhithe Street and has speeding traffic in the narrow carriageway between rows of parked cars. By removing the parking, there is more space to allow cyclists to safely pass oncoming traffic.</p> <p>However, please use sinusoidal speed bumps instead of flat tops, as they slow down vehicles more effectively and are also more comfortable to cycle across.</p>	
<p>there are too many cars clogging the surrounding</p>	

<p>area, so this is good to remove the excess parked cars</p>	
<p>I support the introduction of parking restrictions all along Rotherhithe Street as the current situation with parking permitted on both sides in the same area has been unworkable for years and many representations to the area councillor have been ignored.</p> <p>C10 buses are often unable to squeeze past cars on either side and when 2 buses arrive in the same area grid lock occurs.</p> <p>I do not support speed humps as they make bus travel seriously uncomfortable ... if controlling speed is an issue then installing speed cameras is as effective without impairing comfortable travel for responsible drivers and bus passengers.</p>	
<p>Support double yellow lines. Needed to allow buses to be able to get through.</p>	
<p>Double yellows are a positive move. Parking on both sides is a particular issue for bus and lorry traffic especially when wide vans are parked. It does beg the question as to what provision is being made for the cars / vans displaced from the road?</p>	
<p>These changes Traffic calming measures will reduce traffic speeds</p> <p>Control of parking will ensure sufficient space for</p>	

cyclists will make it safe for cyclists.	
car parking should be restricted and pavement widen	Whilst some properties do have off street parking not all properties do some on street parking is still required
Step in the good direction, I hope there will be later more steps to restrict on-street parking so there is more space for cycling and walking and so there is less cars visible as they are eyesores.	
the c10 bus gets frequently delayed due to the road being single lane as people park in the street, i would strongly support ending all street parking in this area. perhaps the Hilton could rent car parking spaces in their large car park to the public.	
<p>Please see my comments on the previous section. I believe that the two sets of parking bays on the left-hand side of the road (ie before the 2nd flat-top hump) are an additional hazard to cyclists that is unnecessary because the area has plenty of off-street residents parking.</p> <p>(Double yellow lines needed, with a small area near the farm for parking.</p> <p>Leading up to this area is a pinch point with C10 buses having trouble, passing. Add one lane open, because of buses stopped, cyclists and cars on the blind bend and there will be (are) accidents.)</p>	Whilst some properties do have off street parking not all properties do some on street parking is still required. Parking has been restricted to one side of the road to minimise the effects of parked vehicles Traffic calming has been provided to reduce traffic speed
Parked cars on the road are dangerous for cyclists.	
You need the single yellow lines to be double on	There are no single yellow lines the proposal is to

the junctions. Also it's a bus route. You need to rethink the single yellow line as a safety aspect for the safety of all road users.	have double yellow lines where there are no permit bays
You should really be providing more cycle parking rather than parking for vehicles. The air quality in this area is awful and vehicles should be discouraged from parking here.	Cycle parking will be investigated and provided at the detail design stage.

River crossings	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
No bridge no need for route.. WHITE ELEPHANT.	

Road maintenance	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
This is a huge reduction in parking availability for local residents. This area is constantly full of parking.	Its intended to resurface Rotherhithe Street and replace the existing block road hump with an asphalt construction

Safer speeds	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I support the humps but not the controlled parking.</p> <p>Shops are very hard to come by in the Docklands so the introduction on the Coop on this road is very</p>	

<p>handy but it's still too far to walk for a lot of people so we are forced to drive and need to be able to park freely on this road in order to go shopping.</p>	
<p>Fully support the double yellow lines here. This section is always the narrowest on the whole of Rotherhithe Street and has speeding traffic in the narrow carriageway between rows of parked cars. By removing the parking, there is more space to allow cyclists to safely pass oncoming traffic.</p> <p>However, please use sinusoidal speed bumps instead of flat tops, as they slow down vehicles more effectively and are also more comfortable to cycle across.</p>	
<p>The proposals do not solve the issues of cycling on Rotherhithe Street. Parking still takes up most of the space and there is little limitation to vehicle speed or dangerous overtaking. Cyclists will still have to stop to give way to vehicles. A design that brings physical constraints on motor traffic speed and overtaking, such as the "fietsstrasse" (bike street) approach should be considered where bikes have priority over motor vehicles, including an irregular median to discourage overtaking. A few paint markings will not make much difference.</p>	

Safety

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Please see my comments on the previous section. I believe that the two sets of parking bays on the left-hand side of the road (ie before the 2nd flat-top hump) are an additional hazard to cyclists that is unnecessary because the area has plenty of off-street residents parking.</p> <p>(Double yellow lines needed, with a small area near the farm for parking.</p> <p>Leading up to this area is a pinch point with C10 buses having trouble, passing. Add one lane open, because of buses stopped, cyclists and cars on the blind bend and there will be (are) accidents.)</p>	<p>Whilst some properties do have off street parking not all properties do some on street parking is still required. Traffic calming has been provided to reduce traffic speed</p>
<p>I agree that segregated cycle lanes should not be necessary for Rotherhithe Street here but, Rotherhithe Street is not sufficiently traffic-calmed to make this section an easy, accessible ride at all times for less experienced cyclists or young children. I would like to see the implementation of modal filters along Rotherhithe Street so that resident access is maintained while preventing through traffic for all modes other than buses and cycles.</p>	<p>There isn't the space to create a cycle route through Holyoake Footpath; a route has been created at the northern end of the route making use of NCR 425.</p>

<p>It is also worth noting that humps with a sinusoidal profile which are easier to cycle over would be preferable, even if they incorporate a flat top. Also, the humps should not be made of paving stones or any other material which becomes difficult to ride over with age and wear. Perhaps they should be made of asphalt, so that the surface is more elastic and easy to repair.</p> <p>An easy cycle connection ought to be provided to Holyoake Footpath in both directions away from Rotherhithe Street, as it will provide a safe and easy connection to the housing and amenities at Downtown Road. The current way to reach it is via Salter Way, which is very dangerous and scary for less experienced cyclists, given high traffic speeds, wide road and no dedicated space for cycling. An alternative route is necessary here.</p>	
---	--

Segregated space for walking, cycling & driving	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Parking restrictions are a good idea - but you need segregated cycling here too.	There is insufficient space to accommodate segregated facilities along Rotherhithe Street, the flows are considered low and the design has aimed to accommodate the competing road uses at this location
Surely some sort of dedicated cycle route should continue (although I can see there is limited space).	
please create segregated cycle track.	

Wider and well-maintained pavements/walking routes

Comments and or suggestions	Response
car parking should be restricted and pavement widen	Parking has been restricted, which will improve conditions for pedestrians, however, widening the footway\narrowing the carriageway would be detrimental to both buses and cyclist

Section 22. Rotherhithe Street (Silver Walk to Acorn Walk)



Cleaner air	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Increase cycle parking, remove vehicle parking. Stop encouraging more polluting vehicles into this already heavily congested and polluted area.	

Crossing roads is easy and safe	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Zebra crossing to the park please! I run here quite a lot and cars always come speeding down, would be	The measures proposed including additional traffic calming measures and reduced on street parking

good to have a more accessible way of crossing the street.	will assist those crossing the road. As it's the speed and visibility of traffic that is the concern not the volume of traffic
--	--

Do not agree with traffic calming/reduction and cycle lanes	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
USE SALTER ROAD NOT ROTHERHITHE STREET!!! We do not need speed bumps We do not need a change to the parking regulations!!!	This section proposes one new road hump and assists in evening out the location of humps to encourage a smoother drive with the objective of reducing braking and acceleration.
More speed bumps, more parking restrictions - where will all this total madness end?	
Speed hump and build out will cause traffic. The area operates successfully now with self regulating speeds due to the nature of the area. Excessive interventions are not needed.	
I support changes to prevent parking on both sides of the road but oppose the installation of road humps.	
No need for more road humps.	
There should be no introduction of CPZ	
There should be no unsightly road humps. There are enough already.	

<p>Not sure road humps are required.</p>	
<p>See previous comments. (CPZ will be a problem, there are insufficient parking spaces now for residents.</p> <p>There are already traffic calming measures in place - these are detrimental to residents as buses and lorries pay no regard to the humps or speed restrictions and cause road vibrations which can be felt within residential properties.</p> <p>If anything the existing traffic calming measures should be removed.</p> <p>This may save the local council millions in compensation payments for damage to residents property.)</p>	
<p>I do not support the cycleway being directed down Rotherhithe St instead of Salter Rd. I believe it will be dangerous to both cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>There are 2 significant things located on this part of Rotherhithe street and 2 parks used by children and pensioners who will be placed at risk by speeding cyclists. The 2 major issues are the city farm which attracts lots of children, pushchairs and disabled vehicles, this conflicts with ease of progress for cyclists. The second issue is the Doubletree hotel which has a constant flow of very large luxury coaches picking up and dropping off at exactly the</p>	<p>The route uses Rotherhithe Street to link up with the NCR 425 and allow access for local people</p>

point of the junction with Acorn Walk. There are also multiple access points from residences on this part of Rotherhithe st which make it very risky trying to pull out of your car park or side rd in the morning.	
---	--

Easy and safe to cycle	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
sinusoidal humps should be used rather than flat ones	The choice of traffic calming used at this location takes into account all road users, as Rotherhithe Street is a bus route it is considered that the need of bus passengers needs to be taken into account. The height of the calming will be shallow so to minimise the effect on cyclists
USE SALTER ROAD NOT ROTHERHITHE STREET!!! We do not need speed bumps We do not need a change to the parking regulations!!!	The route uses Rotherhithe Street to link up with the NCR 425 and allow access for local people
Parking restrictions are a good idea - but you need segregated cycling here too.	There is insufficient space to accommodate segregated facilities along Rotherhithe Street, the flows are considered low and the design has aimed to accommodate the competing road uses at this location
Parking restrictions are a good idea - but you need segregated cycling here too.	
The road is narrow here and motor vehicles crowd	The reduction of on-street parking together with

<p>out cyclists currently. There would need to be some soft elements to prioritise cyclists.</p>	<p>traffic calming should assist cyclist</p>
<p>The cycle lane provision is inadequate.</p>	
<p>The proposals do not solve the issues of cycling on Rotherhithe Street. Parking still takes up most of the space and there is little limitation to vehicle speed or dangerous overtaking. Cyclists will still have to stop to give way to vehicles. A design that brings physical constraints on motor traffic speed and overatking, such as the "fietsstrasse" (bike street) approach should be considered where bikes have priority over motor vehicles, including an irregular median to discourage overtaking. A few paint markings will not make much difference.</p>	
<p>more cycleways please</p>	
<p>These changes Traffic calming measures will reduce traffic speeds</p> <p>Control of parking will ensure sufficient space for cyclists will make it safer for cyclists.</p>	
<p>This is a bit weak. There will still be too many cars using it as a rat running. Needs road closures to make it safe for cycling.</p>	<p>Rotherhithe Street is used predominately by local traffic and is not considered to be taking rat-running traffic. So any filtered permeability would most likely not displace traffic. As Salter Road is the only road alternative and is considered most likely to be a route traffic would choice to use</p>
<p>The road is narrow here and motor vehicles crowd out cyclists currently. There would need to be some soft elements to prioritise cyclists.</p>	
<p>As the Rotherhithe Street doesn't have any segregated tracks it would be nice to see some</p>	

traffic reduction measures which ensure through traffic takes Salter Road instead of Rotherhithe Street	
Painting bikes on the road does not make a safe cycle route. If people on bikes are to share the highway with other vehicles there needs to be a significant amount of filtered permeability. Traffic at low speed and low volume only. This scheme does not provide that.	
A bus gate or other filtering on Rotherheite Street would be good, perhaps just north of Acorn Walk.	
Bus gate on Rotherhithe Street please!	
bus gate or other filtering on Rotherhithe Street, suggested location for this would be just north of Acorn Walk.	
I want a bus gate or other filtering on Rotherheite Street. The location for this would be just north of Acorn Walk.	
a bus gate or other filtering on Rotherheite Street. Our suggested location for this would be just north of Acorn Walk.	
Bus gate at Acorn Walk would seem sensible	
it would be hard to cycle here even with these changes due to the bus stops and street parking, could a bus gate or some other filtering be installed?	
We suggest asking for a bus gate or other filtering	

<p>on Rotherheite Street. Our suggested location for this would be just north of Acorn Walk.</p>	
<p>A bus gate or other filtering would reduce rat runs through this area. One can be placed just north of Acorn Street.</p>	
<p>Could we have a bus gate or other filtering on Rotherhithe Street maybe just north of Acorn Walk.</p>	
<p>We suggest the addition of a bus gate just north of Acorn Walk to reduce the numbers using Rotherhithe Street as a rat run.</p>	
<p>make sure road is truly low-traffic, possibly introduce filtering or a moving bollard to restrict motor vehicle flows</p>	
<p>Please install a bus gate or other filtering on Rotherhithe Street. My preferred location for this would be just north of Acorn Walk.</p> <p>Also, let's have as few curbs as possible. Use tactile paving instead of curbs to demarcate the border between the road and the pavement. If you are going to put in curbs, then those curbs should be bevelled. Non-bevelled curbs are a extreme danger to cyclists. TfL has started bevelling the curbs on its cycle lanes. Please do the same.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
<p>We suggest the addition of a bus gate just north of Acorn Walk to reduce the numbers using Rotherhithe Street as a rat run.</p>	

Can you please add a bus gate or other filtering on Rotherhithe Street. e.g. just north of Acorn Walk.	
I suggest installing a bus gate or other filtering on Rotherheite Street. The suggested location for this would be just north of Acorn Walk.	

Enjoyable environment	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
More trees not less. If 15 are being felled 9 is not a replacement. Should be 45.	Trees are not effected in this section , the footway widths are likely to preclude any new trees in this section, but will be investigated as part of the design
It isn't great having to cycle over flat top humps or other.	
No new trees?	

Freight/deliveries management (off street/ reduce/ timing)	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Why keep the pavement jutting out into the road at the bus stop by Pearsons Park for the Hilton Double Tree. The hotel regularly has buses unload/loading tourists/guests causing significant congestion removing the bus top jutting out into the road would allow a controlled parking space outside the hotel for hotel buses only	
I think something needs to be done about busses for the doubletree Hilton. They provide a lot of	

issues for traffic in this stretch.	
It is important to provide some short stay or paid parking to enable local businesses to exist	

Improved public transport (reliability, more & direct routes, accessibility, overcrowding)

Comments and or suggestions	Response
Parking on either side of road to be removed to facilitate traffic which turns 2 lane road to a single lane road creating bottleneck for buses.	The proposals regulate parking, which will facilitate the movement of buses

More and safer cycle infrastructure/ routes

Comments and or suggestions	Response
Rotherhithe street needs a segregated cycle lane. There is no enforcement of traffic laws and cars speed and drive aggressively.	There is insufficient space to accommodate segregated facilities along Rotherhithe Street, the flows are considered low and the design has aimed to accommodate the competing road uses at this location
Parking restrictions are a good idea - but you need segregated cycling here too.	
The road is narrow here and motor vehicles crowd out cyclists currently. There would need to be some soft elements to prioritise cyclists.	The reduction of on-street parking together with traffic calming should assist cyclist
The proposals do not solve the issues of cycling on Rotherhithe Street. Parking still takes up most of the space and there is little limitation to vehicle speed or dangerous overtaking. Cyclists will still have to stop to give way to vehicles. A design that	

brings physical constraints on motor traffic speed and overatking, such as the "fietsstrasse" (bike street) approach should be considered where bikes have priority over motor vehicles, including an irregular median to discourage overtaking. A few paint markings will not make much difference.	
The cycle lane provision is inadequate.	
more cycleways please	
This is a bit weak. There will still be too many cars using it as a rat running. Needs road closures to make it safe for cycling.	Rotherhithe Street is used predominately by local traffic and is not considered to be taking rat-running traffic. So any filtered permeability would most likely not displace traffic. As Salter Road is the only alternative and is considered most likely to be a route traffic would choice to use
A bus gate or other filtering on Rotherheite Street would be good, perhaps just north of Acorn Walk.	
Bus gate on Rotherhithe Street please!	
bus gate or other filtering on Rotherhithe Street, suggested location for this would be just north of Acorn Walk.	
I want a bus gate or other filtering on Rotherheite Street. The location for this would be just north of Acorn Walk.	
a bus gate or other filtering on Rotherheite Street. Our suggested location for this would be just north of Acorn Walk.	
Bus gate at Acorn Walk would seem sensible	
Please could you add a bus gate or other filtering on Rotherhithe Street - just north of Acorn Walk.	
bus gate or other filtering on Rotherheite Street.	

Our suggested location for this would be just north of Acorn Walk.	
We suggest asking for a bus gate or other filtering on Rotherheite Street. Our suggested location for this would be just north of Acorn Walk.	
A bus gate or other filtering would reduce rat runs through this area. One can be placed just north of Acorn Street.	
Could we have a bus gate or other filtering on Rotherhithe Street maybe just north of Acorn Walk.	
We suggest the addition of a bus gate just north of Acorn Walk to reduce the numbers using Rotherhithe Street as a rat run.	

More enforcement	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Rotherhithe street needs a segregated cycle lane. There is no enforcement of traffic laws and cars speed and drive aggressively.	Southwark to not have the powers to enforce speed limits, however our designs can influence drivers speeds. In <i>this</i> instance the provision of traffic calming together with regulating parking

No controlled parking	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
USE SALTER ROAD NOT ROTHERHITHE STREET!!!	Controlled parking zones (CPZs) are the most effective way that the council can manage kerbside

<p>We do not need speed bumps</p> <p>We do not need a change to the parking regulations!!!</p>	<p>space. If all new developments had enough parking for all residents, traffic in the area would increase as would air pollution. Southwark Council's Movement Plan encourages more sustainable modes of travel</p>
<p>More speed bumps, more parking restrictions - where will all this total madness end?</p>	
<p>There should be no introduction of CPZ</p> <p>There should be no unsightly road humps. There are enough already.</p>	
<p>See previous comments.</p> <p>(CPZ will be a problem, there are insufficient parking spaces now for residents.</p> <p>There are already traffic calming measures in place - these are detrimental to residents as buses and lorries pay no regard to the humps or speed restrictions and cause road vibrations which can be felt within residential properties.</p> <p>If anything the existing traffic calming measures should be removed.</p> <p>This may save the local council millions in compensation payments for damage to residents property.)</p>	

<p>As stated previously (The introduction of cpz is awful</p> <p>Making it more expensive for the local people to live here .</p> <p>Even though im sure there will be a comment stating residents will have a reduced fee , its still another cost)</p>	
<p>I support the humps but not the controlled parking.</p> <p>Shops are very hard to come by in the Docklands so the introduction on the Coop on this road is very handy but it's still too far to walk for a lot of people so we are forced to drive and need to be able to park freely on this road in order to go shopping.</p>	<p>Jo Redshaw</p>

Other	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Have you thought of those children riding in front of cars and buses?</p>	
<p>You really need this drawing with cars parked, two buses trying to pass, schools run cars backed up behind the buses, plus your cyclists trying to get around the buses and cars, with motorbikes speeding past everything.</p>	
<p>no great advantage to this</p>	

Promote local economy	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I support the humps but not the controlled parking.</p> <p>Shops are very hard to come by in the Docklands so the introduction on the Coop on this road is very handy but it's still too far to walk for a lot of people so we are forced to drive and need to be able to park freely on this road in order to go shopping.</p>	<p>Jo redshaw</p>
<p>It is important to provide some short stay or paid parking to enable local businesses to exist</p>	<p>Short stay and paid parking is being provided where appropriate</p>

Reduced on street parking	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Only one new flat top road New double yellow hump is enough.</p> <p>Please add double yellow line on Silver Walk as well.</p>	<p>Jo Redshaw</p>
<p>Increase cycle parking, remove vehicle parking. Stop encouraging more polluting vehicles into this already heavily congested and polluted area.</p>	<p>Cycle parking will be investigated as part of the detailed design</p>
<p>Parking restrictions are a good idea - but you need segregated cycling here too.</p>	
<p>I support changes to prevent parking on both sides</p>	

of the road but oppose the installation of road humps.	
Support new double yellow lines	
Cars parked at the side of the road are a danger to cyclists	
Double yellows are a positive move. Parking on both sides is a particular issue for bus and lorry traffic especially when wide vans are parked. It does beg the question as to what provision is being made for the cars / vans displaced from the road?	
These changes Traffic calming measures will reduce traffic speeds	
Control of parking will ensure sufficient space for cyclists will make it safer for cyclists.	

Remove speed humps	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>See previous comments.</p> <p>(CPZ will be a problem, there are insufficient parking spaces now for residents.</p> <p>There are already traffic calming measures in place - these are detrimental to residents as buses and lorries pay no regard to the humps or speed restrictions and cause road vibrations which can be felt within residential properties.</p>	

If anything the existing traffic calming measures should be removed.

This may save the local council millions in compensation payments for damage to residents property.)

Have your say on the proposals

Improve air quality	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>This proposal is only going to make life harder for local community and make the area less safe and more polluted.</p>	<p>The provision of safer cycle facilities will give people the opportunity to cycle rather than drive, which will assist in the improvement of air quality.</p> <p>Overall support for the scheme is 78 %</p>
<p>The whole scheme is totally unnecessary and will create huge difficulties for everybody in this large area, whether they are residents or those who are just passing through it.</p>	
<p>The already very poor air quality will be made massively worse, and even those who choose to walk or the cyclists will be breathing in the most foul air imaginable. Thousands of people will be permanently inconvenienced, nothing will be able to move, even walking at 2.5mph will be considered as 'speeding', and the health of everyone affected by this total madness, will be seriously damaged.</p>	
<p>Most of important of all - HOW MUCH IS ALL THIS MADNESS AND CHAOS GOING TO COST US TAXPAYERS?</p>	
<p>I will make a prediction, and I am absolutely sure that it will be proved to be correct. My prediction is that the outcome of this "so-called" consultation will</p>	

be that "83% of respondents strongly support the proposals". The reason I make this claim is because the outcome of every "consultation" I have ever participated in over many years has, without exception, come up with the same result. Amazing isn't it? It is NEVER 68%, or 47% or 74% or indeed any other percentage, it is ALWAYS 83%. The reason for this is quite obvious to those of us with a living brain cell - THE WHOLE CONSULTATION IS A TOTAL SHAM!!! The Council and also the Mad Mayor of London are totally corrupt from top to bottom, and they make sure that they always get their own way with total disregard for the needs of the taxpaying public. They choose to ignore the facts that the slower the traffic moves, the worse the air pollution gets, also the more stress everyone suffers from the inconvenience and the time that is wasted, the frustration of being late for important appointments, and the risks that everyone takes in order to try to get to where they need to be on time.

It is quite obvious that the corrupt Council always makes sure all these proposals, (regardless of the subject, whether it be the highways, housing planning, transport etc), have already been passed by the Council, and will always go ahead regardless, and no doubt the contractors have already been decided, well in advance of any so-called "consultation" is ever put forward to the general public, who always have to pay for the

<p>nonsense, and always have to suffer the consequences of the outcome. TOTAL BONKERS AND UNSCRUPULOUS MADNESS.</p>	
<p>I worry that the introduction of new traffic signals will lead to worse air quality</p>	
<p>Building a cycle way on redriff road makes absolutely no sense for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there is a cycle way through surrey docks sports ground that is MUCH safer and MUCH more enjoyable (this is what I take if I need to go into central london); - there are very few cyclist on redriff road, this is a huge waste of money; money should be instead focused on area that are NOT on or close to the road (such as the surrey docks sports ground). <p>Finally, adding traffic lights in lieu of roundabouts WILL create more pollution: the traffic there is low so adding places where cars and motorbikes will be idling does not make sense.</p>	
<p>These changes should help decrease traffic speeds, without hopefully adversely affecting the buses, and encourage cyclists and walkers, and reduce noise and improve air quality with a bit of luck!</p>	
<p>cycling is essential to reduce the harmful effects of air quality so we strongly support these proposals</p>	

to increase the uptake of cycling	
<p>The city needs become more cycle friendly. A lot of the times there are no cycle lanes or routes at all, and if there are, they are badly built. The air quality needs to go up so we need to get more people cycling or walking.</p>	
<p>We need protected bike lanes so that anyone aged 8-80 feels safe and is safe to get onto 2 wheels. More people cycling for everyday local journeys is essential to improve air quality, lower pollution, lower the number of road crashes, get more people active and therefore tackle the obesity crisis which is threatening to bankrupt the NHS</p>	
<p>This is an absolutely fantastic proposal. I support it in the strongest possible terms. It will encourage people onto their bikes, not just in the immediate area but around the borough and beyond. This will improve air quality, decrease the city's carbon footprint, and improve residents' health.</p>	
<p>I strongly support the overall improvement project for better air quality and safety for cyclists.</p>	
<p>Strongly support segregated cycleways.</p> <p>I will support any proposals that encourage walking/cycling, and discourage driving.</p> <p>I have asthma and have to take medicine every day. When I lived in Cambridge I didn't need to, but the air quality in London is so poor I have ended up</p>	

<p>in hospital after cycling in too much pollution.</p> <p>This is also essential for safety - too many cyclists have been killed or badly injured. Improving cycling infrastructure will encourage more people to cycle, taking pressure off the overground and underground. It will particularly encourage women I know to cycle, most of whom are too scared to try at the moment.</p>	
<p>Dedicated cycle lane is a positive step to safety and air pollution and hope this will help promote cycling.</p>	
<p>All changes need to take into account air quality too.</p>	
<p>I strongly support the segregation of all cycle paths. At present, the route is extremely dangerous for cyclists who are forced to share a bus lane with buses and taxis. Ultimately buses and taxi are still polluting - they should be sharing a single lane for all vehicles (in each direction) with other cars/vans etc. I have been hit by vehicles whilst on my bicycle on the Rotherhithe roundabout multiple times.</p> <p>Given the state of the air quality in this area generated by the traffic that builds up on a daily basis around the Rotherhithe tunnel, the council should be doing everything to discourage motorists coming into the area altogether. You should not be providing concessions and additional parking for anytime of motor vehicle user on these routes.</p>	

<p>Parks such as Southwark Park are ruined by the noise and air pollution from the incredibly busy roads surrounding it. This at the expense of residents, adults and children, in the area.</p> <p>Taxi's in particular use this route, often without passengers, and benefit from the reduced traffic in the bus lane. Yet, they usually drive dated vehicles with poor emission quality to no one's benefit. They should be sharing the main lanes with other cars. They carry a small number of passengers, unlike buses, and should therefore NOT benefit from the use of faster bus lanes.</p>	
--	--

Crossing roads is easy and safe	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Redriff Road to Rotherhithe Street needs more trees in addition to those lost to the scheme. The new zebra in this section is not on an obvious desire line and should be closer to Onega Gate allowing safe access for pedestrians to the woodlands. The speed limit on the peninsula should be put back to 30mph. The drop to 20mph saw a marked increase in speeding and overtaking because it is too slow for such a large, long road. The introduction of zebras and in lane bus stops will curb the excess speed and limit overtaking but drivers need to be free to make progress at a</p>	<p>Observations have shown most people that cross here are going to and from the bus stops, the crossing has been proposed between the location of the repositioned bus stops.</p>

<p>reasonable rate otherwise.</p>	
<p>I oppose commingling cyclist crossing point with pedestrian zebra crossings. These two should be kept separate and a cyclist crossing should not have priority over cars driving on Salter Road / Redriff Road.</p> <p>The proposed scheme is too complex and not commensurate with the low number of cyclists in the area.</p> <p>The proposed scheme will lead to loss of trees and increase in travel times, traffic and pollution due to removal of mini-roundabouts and introduction of new cycle crossings.</p>	<p>The cycle and pedestrian crossing are separated with each having their dedicated area to cross Salter Road</p>
<p>In principal I support making streets better for cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>This should be integrated with Suds, good quality planting, more green..it is good for our mental health.</p> <p>Also handy cycle racks near shops..not some inconvenient place all together up the road!</p> <p>Level crossings for pedestrians are a bit of a pain for cyclists..although suppose pedestrians should be the priority.</p>	

<p>Trees and planting help give the message to drive carefully, better than signs and bumps.</p> <p>Good quality paving always makes your walk more pleasant.</p>	
<p>The cycle route is in the wrong place. Traffic lights will slow up traffic which already backs-up enough.</p> <p>Apart for a few zebra crossings and some double yellow lines this is little to benefit those who live here. It is all about those coming into the area.</p> <p>It is as if the whole project is for cyclists. Is it?</p> <p>Put the money into something really useful like the bridge.</p> <p>Improve transport links on the buses and tubes, before you increase the population with the Canada Water development. Local residents were promised that there would be no problems, because all would be sorted out by cross-rail and the new bridge.</p> <p>Were we lied too?</p>	
<p>I do not understand the need for a segregated cycle lane on Redriff Road.</p> <p>The road does not have many cars to start with,</p>	<p>The additional crossing have been provided at regular intervals to assist those with prams and wheelchairs</p>

<p>and extremely few cyclists. Most of the very few cyclists simply just use the pavements, which is just fine as there are so few of them and also not many pedestrians.</p> <p>The whole scheme is completely needless, will make the road uglier and harder to use for pedestrians - especially as there is now a massive curb down the entire length of the road making crossing with a pushchair very difficult.</p> <p>The scheme you are proposing would be more appropriate for some sort of major road where there are big problems with pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles sharing the space - but this is simply not the case on leafy, quiet Redriff Road. Please don't make this nice road so ugly and unwieldy with this terrible plan.</p>	
---	--

Cyclist behaviour & keep off pavements	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I am glad you are removing the one way systems I think it will help to make life pleasanter for those of us who do not have a car. But I am very concerned about the cycleways. I have great difficulty in seeing cyclists and they do not use bells anymore to let you know they are there. I also find that they cycle on the pavement even though there are cycle lanes available to them. I don't like the idea of the</p>	<p>The vast majority of the proposed cycleway is segregated from the footway, which cyclists are more likely to use than the footway.</p> <p>At the bus stops raised zebra crossings are provided to assist pedestrians to the footway</p>

bus stops being in islands and my having to cross the road to get to them and when I get off them.	
Need to ensure cyclists stay off paths and respect Highway Code/crossings/traffic lights. Cyclists seem to think they are above the law.	Once works commence a public awareness programme will take place, explaining to local residents how these junction layout should used

Discourage car ownership and usage	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I strongly support the segregation of all cycle paths. At present, the route is extremely dangerous for cyclists who are forced to share a bus lane with buses and taxis. Ultimately buses and taxi are still polluting - they should be sharing a single lane for all vehicles (in each direction) with other cars/vans etc. I have been hit by vehicles whilst on my bicycle on the Rotherhithe roundabout multiple times.</p> <p>Given the state of the air quality in this area generated by the traffic that builds up on a daily basis around the Rotherhithe tunnel, the council should be doing everything to discourage motorists coming into the area altogether. You should not be providing concessions and additional parking for anytime of motor vehicle user on these routes.</p> <p>Parks such as Southwark Park are ruined by the noise and air pollution from the incredibly busy roads surrounding it. This at the expense of</p>	

<p>residents, adults and children, in the area.</p> <p>Taxi's in particular use this route, often without passengers, and benefit from the reduced traffic in the bus lane. Yet, they usually drive dated vehicles with poor emission quality to no one's benefit. They should be sharing the main lanes with other cars. They carry a small number of passengers, unlike buses, and should therefore NOT benefit from the use of faster bus lanes.</p>	
---	--

Do not agree with traffic calming/reduction and cycle lanes	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>The separate dual cycle way is not necessary. I cycle both Salter road and Rotherhithe street every day and can tell from experience it is not needed. What we need it to slow down the traffic on both these roads, and facilitate traffic with more double yellow lines on Rotherhithe street, so that the c10 bus can easily circulate.</p>	<p>The provision of cycleways, particularly where segregated, allows us to provide valuable missing infrastructure, that will encourage active travel and give people a choice over their mode of travel. Every journey carried out actively helps contribute to less polluted air.</p>
<p>Why is so much consideration & tax payers money going on a tiny minority of people instead of being used for the wider communities? Other similar road schemes in London have caused more traffic than before.</p>	
<p>I do oppose in particular creating two way street on Lower Road and introducing a segregated cycleway there.</p>	

<p>I also oppose the Rotherhite cycleway.</p> <p>The main traffic issue in Rotherhite is in my opinion the roundabout before the Rotherhite tunnel and the traffic jams caused by it. This should be addressed via a tunnel leading into Rotherhite tunnel that runs beneath the roundabout, so bypassing the roundabout. This would ease the most pressing traffic issue in the area and improve air quality there!</p> <p>This is much more important than some cosmetic cycleway measures...</p>	
<p>Southwark is trying to build a route that will literally go nowhere and deliver no benefit... has anyone considered the complete waste of taxpayers money... what appalling planning by Southwark.</p>	
<p>As per comments throughout, buses currently have no issues pulling away so that is not a valid pro. Reducing pavements for pedestrians in favour of cyclists is also a terrible idea. You will create congestion on a quiet road that is just used by residents. A cycle way is unnecessary on roads as quiet as these.</p>	
<p>Don't understand the need for the full CPZ or cycleway</p>	
<p>here is no need for cycle lanes. The roads are wide, suburban style, leafy and quiet. This will waste tax</p>	

<p>payers money and make roads less safe for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users.</p> <p>Please do not disrupt our quiet residential area with all these road works and disruptions for no reason!</p> <p>There are a few areas that could be improved with some better road crossings</p> <p>Please listen carefully to Rotherhithe street residents re parking, as the current plans are insufficient for all the cars that park there and this whole plan looks like a way of taxing residents as that street is seldom used by non-residents so parking bays seem unnecessary</p>	
<p>I do not think this area needs any cycle ways. The area is already safe for cyclists and this work will be a waste of taxpayers money.</p>	
<p>I live in the direct area impacted. I do not think the cycle route is necessary and don't believe it will be highly utilised enough. There are many off road routes that can be used and cyclist (of which I am one) should be able to cycle on these roads without the need of additional work.</p> <p>Do not agree with loosing grass verges and trees.</p> <p>I do agree with the double yellow lines on Rotherhithe street, salter road, red riff road.</p>	

Whilst I accept the proposals may well enable the C10 bus route along Rotherhithe Street to flow more easily there are a number of aspects to the proposals that are negative and I strongly oppose as follows.

1. Segregated cycle lanes only serve to make the roads appear more cluttered, more "concrete" / built up and less green. They are unsightly.

2. I strongly object to the proposed loss of existing mature trees. It is not adequate replacing them with new, young, small trees.

3. The proposed controlled parking zones along Rotherhithe Street will serve merely to cause residents to park their cars elsewhere, in already congested streets, thereby causing parking problems and hardship for other residents.

Lower road is a major traffic through-route south of the river, with no reasonable alternative. This route already gets congested and this congestion is slowly getting worse. The priority of any road changes should surely be to reduce the road congestion. The volume of motor vehicles, I expect, would outnumber bicycles by at least 1,000-to-1. The priority should be the majority, not a few people who happen to be today's political fad.

The cycle route along Redriff Road looks like no more than someone's personal pet project born out of a stupid idea. The benefits do not appear, to me, to justify the cost of implementation, the disruption to the area, and the worsening of an already congested part of London.

What plans are there to undo all of the changes, and what funds are being held back to do this, should the whole thing turn out to be a congestion disaster? Whose idea is the whole thing and will they resign if the expected congestion disaster unfolds?

When is the long-proposed footbridge from Rotherhithe to the Isle of Dogs materialising? Have Thames Clippers successfully lobbied against it?

Money would far better be spent by extending the Jubilee Line from Canada Water along to Greenwich to connect to the DLR and on to the O2, with 2-3 stations in-between. The area from Surrey Quays to Greenwich, once a commercial area and now mostly a modern residential area, has zero public transport other than busses, from Surrey Quays all the way to Greenwich. This is a planning cock-up of the highest order.

In as much as I am aware that the purpose of these measure are for safety, the reality of it is that more people have been killed on the road with the cycle

lanes than when there were none. You see children cycling on the main road with the mentality of "kill me if you can attitude". I believe all these new construction are creating jobs for others with the main contractors benefiting, but there are other ways of creating jobs without destroying what is in place and working perfectly fine. I am therefore, **STRONGLY OPPOSING** to more new cycle lane

I do not understand the need for a segregated cycle lane on Redriff Road.

The road does not have many cars to start with, and extremely few cyclists. Most of the very few cyclists simply just use the pavements, which is just fine as there are so few of them and also not many pedestrians.

The whole scheme is completely needless, will make the road uglier and harder to use for pedestrians - especially as there is now a massive curb down the entire length of the road making crossing with a pushchair very difficult.

The scheme you are proposing would be more appropriate for some sort of major road where there are big problems with pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles sharing the space - but this is simply not the case on leafy, quiet Redriff Road. Please don't make this nice road so ugly and unwieldy with this terrible plan.

Building a cycle way on redriff road makes absolutely no sense for the following reasons:

- there is a cycle way through surrey docks sports ground that is MUCH safer and MUCH more enjoyable (this is what I take if I need to go into central london);

- there are very few cyclist on redriff road, this is a huge waste of money; money should be instead focused on area that are NOT on or close to the road (such as the surrey docks sports ground).

Finally, adding traffic lights in lieu of roundabouts WILL create more pollution: the traffic there is low so adding places where cars and motorbikes will be idling does not make sense.

There should be no reduction in carriageway width for motor vehicles.

There should be no loss of trees, verges or bus lay-bys

There should be no loss of parking spaces.

There should be no introduction of CPZ.

Rotherhithe Street residents should not be penalised for over development of Canada Water in

<p>excess of recommended urban density.</p>	
<p>I am strongly opposed to the cycle lanes as I do not think it will improve the lives of long standing local residents.</p>	
<p>The main reason for having a Rotherhithe cycleway was to provide for the extra cycles because a cycle bridge over the Thames was planned. I think the Rotherhithe cycleway should not be proceeded with until the need for it can be proven once the free ferry has commenced because the expense would not be justified. Currently there are already designated cycle routes in the area.</p>	
<p>I support some aspects of these proposal [ie restricting parking to prevent the existing grid locks] ... but oppose others such as traffic lights and speed humps.</p> <p>You must look at parking along the whole of Rotherhithe Street from the Youth hostel to Salter Road.</p> <p>You must also look at the road layout at the tunnel entrance and create a slip road to permit vehicles and buses from Jamaica Road to turn in to Brunel Road and the Rotherhithe Peninsula.</p> <p>The bus lane leading to the tunnel mouth from Bermondsey has no purpose if buses get stuck in the grid lock at the tunnel mouth.</p>	<p>A total of Nine road humps are proposed along the length of this proposal, five are specifically aimed at helping people cross the road four are zebra crossings. The borough has a 20 mph limit, whilst we can not enforce this limit we can design schemes that encourage people to observe the speed limit.</p> <p>The six of the humps are proposed on Rotherhithe Street and are spaced to discourage erratic driving</p>

Excessive number of new road humps on Rotherhithe street.	
But please no road humps: they cause discomfort to cyclists and the disabled and encourage erratic driving.	

Easy and safe to cycle	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Great to see the Council promoting safer cycling routes. Would like to see them go even further to reduce speeding on Salter Road. Segregated cycle ways are essential to give more people the confidence to get on their bikes. Why no proposals to improve cycling facilities on the North side of the peninsula on Salter Road?	Southwark are currently investigating continuing the cycle route round Salter Road
New, safe cycleways are always a welcome addition to streets, although this scheme seems to connect to the location of the proposed crossing to Canary Wharf which has for now been cancelled. The scheme should continue as soon as possible on the other half of the Rotherhithe peninsula to connect with the roundabout and the CS4.	
Redriff Road is very wide, including a median, and the loss of many trees seems unnecessary. Cycling and greening should go together and not put in conflict. Space for cycling infrastructure should be taken from vehicular lanes.	

<p>The proposals for Rotherhithe Street do not address the issues, leaving most roadspace for parking and forcing cyclists to stop for oncoming vehicles and to move from one side of the carriageway to the other to avoid cars moving and parked.</p>	
<p>The implementation of the Rotherhithe Cycleway is welcome, as it provides safe, dedicated infrastructure for cyclists.</p> <p>It is unclear what happens with the cycleway on Salter Road to the north of the Rotherhithe Street junction. With the CPZ banning parking, there is a missed opportunity to at least continue with a mandatory cycle lane along Salter Road to provide some protection for cyclists.</p> <p>We welcome the two new zebras at Salter Road/Rotherhithe Street - these are badly needed.</p>	
<p>The plans for segregated cycling and restricted parking are excellent. But there should be segregated cycling the whole way!</p>	<p>As above we is currently investigating extend around Salter Road. There is insufficient space to provide a segregated facility on to Rotherhithe Street</p>
<p>The requirements of cyclists (many of whom are passing through from Lewisham and Greenwich) seem to be constantly put ahead of locals , particularly at the expense of the elderly and disabled who rely on buses .</p>	<p>The provision of safer cycling facilities is a priority for the Council. This proposal allows us to link existing and proposed cycle routes. These proposals will give people the opportunity to cycle local journeys as well journeys further afield.</p>

<p>It is vital that bus routes are kept clear to enable buses to run at a decent speed and to for the frequency to be reliable . Restricting these routes will increase pollution due to traffic jams .</p> <p>You do a disservice to cyclists by encouraging them onto bus routes and major thoroughfares alongside the vehicles most likely to kill them . Even if they have segregated lanes they will need to cross junctions where they risk their lives .</p> <p>A more creative solution using parks , river walks or side streets would be far more appropriate.</p> <p>The popularity of the cycle routes through the former bricklayers arms railway depot and along Williw walk show just how popular these routes can be when placed properly through residential streets away from polluting heavy vehicles that might kill them .</p> <p>The first time a cyclist dies on Jamaica road or Redriff road as they cross a junction out of the cycle lane , it will be perfectly correct that Southwark should be questioned as to why cyclists were encouraged to be on such busy roads</p>	
<p>with the use of tiger crossings, signage should be used to notify motorists that they have to give way.</p>	<p>Once works commence a public awareness programme will take place, explaining to local</p>

<p>most motorists are unaware of these crossings, which can create fatal accidents.</p> <p>SUDS should be considered on new pavements to green the area and help prevent flooding</p>	<p>residents how these junction and crossing layout should be used</p>
<p>looks good - it would be good to periodically add gaps in the segregation to allow cycles access to the main traffic lanes where convenient.</p>	
<p>These plans are really impressive. It will make it so much safer for me to cycle and I would feel confident cycling with children on the cycle tracks. I'm a bit worried there will be too much rat running on some bits of the scheme for it to feel safe and so there needs to be more road closures as part of this. Overall though I think this will encourage people to ditch their car and get on their bike - more of this please Southwark!!!</p>	
<p>Strongly support the segregated cycleway along redriff road, though it will be a shame to lose lots of the green feel the road currently has (though it will be greener in another way). The proposals for rotherhithe street aren't as encouraging.</p> <p>In general, I'm not sure why the C10 has to go through Rotherhithe street at all and why it can't go along Salter/Redriff road like the 381? There are plenty of cutways through between these roads and this would make having a segregated cycleway along rotherhithe street far easier to implement</p>	

<p>which would be much more attractive if the Peckham/rotherhithe route is really going to take off especially if the free ferry service happens. Surely this would also significantly increase C10 bus times through the area.</p>	
<p>This will make it safer for my employees to cycle to work.</p>	
<p>This proposal really goes the right direction on every level.</p> <p>Surrey Quays is a peaceful neighbourhood and a really good candidate to make people switch to walking and cycling, whether for their entire journey through the new cycleway 4, or to the tube station. This cycleway offshoot will connect residents and visitors to the rest of London very easily.</p>	
<p>This is a great proposal that will fill an essential gap that currently exists on the cycleway that is being constructed. It will encourage many more people to cycle safely and reduce the pressure on the road, tube, and the bus network. I strongly support this plan. This also means, for someone like me who currently lives closer to a cycle route -- moving closer to (renting/buying) this cycleway is now an option/possibility.</p>	
<p>Making cycling safer is the way forward in a climate emergency. Please don't take too much notice of the loud but badly informed anti-cycling lobby.</p>	
<p>The council should be increasing the number of</p>	

<p>trees instead of reducing them. The loss of mature trees should be compensated with more trees.</p> <p>Strongly support the proposals and welcome the creation of segregated bike lanes. The proposals could be more ambitious by reducing (or eliminating) all parking in Redriff / Alfred salter.</p>	
<p>cycling is essential to reduce the harmful effects of air quality so we strongly support these proposals to increase the uptake of cycling</p>	
<p>these areas are difficult to cycle, I'd be very happy if we got some new cycle routes</p>	
<p>As a regular cyclist using these roads I strongly support those proposals.</p>	
<p>Very positive about the improved cycling infrastructure. I believe it will get more people into active travel and lead to a healthier city for everyone.</p>	
<p>Good to see access to Surrey Quays shopping area being considered, as currently much less pleasant by bike. Also the link to the routes through the woodland are a welcome addition. It is also very good to see the plans through lower road include segregated provision to continue Cycleway 4 – a vital connection.</p>	
<p>I strongly support the overall improvement project for better air quality and safety for cyclists.</p>	
<p>Strongly support segregated cycleways.</p>	

<p>I will support any proposals that encourage walking/cycling, and discourage driving.</p> <p>I have asthma and have to take medicine every day. When I lived in Cambridge I didn't need to, but the air quality in London is so poor I have ended up in hospital after cycling in too much pollution.</p> <p>This is also essential for safety - too many cyclists have been killed or badly injured. Improving cycling infrastructure will encourage more people to cycle, taking pressure off the overground and underground. It will particularly encourage women I know to cycle, most of whom are too scared to try at the moment.</p>	
<p>segregated cycle lanes are essential for cycling with young children.</p>	
<p>I strong support enhancements for cyclists in Rotherhithe.</p>	
<p>Will be a fantastic edition and encourage me to cycle more</p>	
<p>I strongly support the segregation of all cycle paths. At present, the route is extremely dangerous for cyclists who are forced to share a bus lane with buses and taxis. Ultimately buses and taxi are still polluting - they should be sharing a single lane for all vehicles (in each direction) with other cars/vans etc. I have been hit by vehicles whilst on my bicycle on the Rotherhithe roundabout multiple times.</p>	

Given the state of the air quality in this area generated by the traffic that builds up on a daily basis around the Rotherhithe tunnel, the council should be doing everything to discourage motorists coming into the area altogether. You should not be providing concessions and additional parking for anytime of motor vehicle user on these routes.

Parks such as Southwark Park are ruined by the noise and air pollution from the incredibly busy roads surrounding it. This at the expense of residents, adults and children, in the area.

Taxi's in particular use this route, often without passengers, and benefit from the reduced traffic in the bus lane. Yet, they usually drive dated vehicles with poor emission quality to no one's benefit. They should be sharing the main lanes with other cars. They carry a small number of passengers, unlike buses, and should therefore NOT benefit from the use of faster bus lanes.

adding cycle lanes and traffic control measures make cycling safer.

Strongly support this. It is a quiet and residential area and the more that can be done to encourage safe cycling the better so thank you for developing this plan.

<p>I am not sure of the timing but anything to get the cycle paths in place before the masterplan work begins would be fantastic. Once the masterplan starts the area will be full of large construction lorries and vehicles and to have a safe segregated space to cycle during that time will make the whole area safer and more pleasant to live and travel in.</p>	
<p>I think the proposals will make cycling on the route far simpler and safer.</p>	
<p>Dedicated cycle lane is a positive step to safety and air pollution and hope this will help promote cycling.</p>	
<p>I regularly commute by bike from Streatham to canary wharf. There is currently no route that is particularly safe or pleasant - I would be really keen to use this route via ferry if it were implemented.</p>	
<p>My only other comment is that it would be great to see more routes that make it more feasible to cycle or walk for local journeys (as well as commuting) as this would help reduce the number of short distance car journeys.</p>	
<p>I strongly support the proposals for the Rotherhithe Cycleway. This scheme combined with the Control Parking Zone and Lower Road scheme, are key to unlocking active travel in North East Southwark. We hope these plans represent the start of transforming all of Southwark from car dominated to a place for people, prioritising active travel, be that by foot, bicycle or public transport. This will make our roads</p>	

safer and our streets better places to live, work and shop as well as helping us deal with the climate crisis the council so wisely declared.	
---	--

Enjoyable environment	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Redriff Road to Rotherhithe Street needs more trees in addition to those lost to the scheme. The new zebra in this section is not on an obvious desire line and should be closer to Onega Gate allowing safe access for pedestrians to the woodlands. The speed limit on the peninsula should be put back to 30mph. The drop to 20mph saw a marked increase in speeding and overtaking because it is too slow for such a large, long road. The introduction of zebras and in lane bus stops will curb the excess speed and limit overtaking but drivers need to be free to make progress at a reasonable rate otherwise.</p>	<p>15 trees are affected within this proposal and we have identified nine new locations for trees. The designs developed to date we have taken great care to minimise the loss of trees. .</p> <p>At the next design stage we will continue this and investigate opportunities to plant additional trees</p> <p>The Lower Road project has a net gain of ten trees.</p> <p>As with the trees we have tried to minimise the effects of the loss of the grass verges, but along Redriff Road\Salter Road there is a loss of grass verges.</p>
<p>Strongly support the segregated cycleway along redriff road, though it will be a shame to lose lots of the green feel the road currently has (though it will be greener in another way). The proposals for rotherhithe street aren't as encouraging.</p>	
<p>In general, I'm not sure why the C10 has to go through Rotherhithe street at all and why it can't go along Salter/Redriff road like the 381? There are</p>	

<p>plenty of cutways through between these roads and this would make having a segregated cycleway along rotherhithe street far easier to implement which would be much more attractive if the Peckham/rotherhithe route is really going to take off especially if the free ferry service happens. Surely this would also significantly increase C10 bus times through the area.</p>	
<p>A bit more imagination as to how not to cut down trees or at least to include more planting throughout.</p>	
<p>More trees not less. If 15 are being felled 9 is not a replacement. Should be 45.</p>	
<p>here seem to be a lot more trees being cut than new trees being planted.</p> <p>Trees and greenery are an essential part of citizens well being, if the goal is to improve the pedestrian and cycling experience, scenery should be pleasing to the eye.</p>	
<p>The council should be increasing the number of trees instead of reducing them. The loss of mature trees should be compensated with more trees. Strongly support the proposals and welcome the creation of segregated bike lanes. The proposals could be more ambitious by reducing (or eliminating) all parking in Redriff / Alfred salter.</p>	
<p>I oppose the changes because it means the loss of a significant green verge and many trees. I know</p>	

<p>the plan notes that there will be a net gain in trees, but these will be in different locations to those that will be removed. This will change the quality of the street and walking environment. More trees, planting and landscaping should be provided to mitigate the proposed loss, not elsewhere but in the same locations and proximity to the loss.</p>	
<p>New, safe cycleways are always a welcome addition to streets, although this scheme seems to connect to the location of the proposed crossing to Canary Wharf which has for now been cancelled. The scheme should continue as soon as possible on the other half of the Rotherhithe peninsula to connect with the roundabout and the CS4.</p> <p>Redriff Road is very wide, including a median, and the loss of many trees seems unnecessary. Cycling and greening should go together and not put in conflict. Space for cycling infrastructure should be taken from vehicular lanes.</p> <p>The proposals for Rotherhithe Street do not address the issues, leaving most roadspace for parking and forcing cyclists to stop for oncoming vehicles and to move from one side of the carriageway to the other to avoid cars moving and parked.</p>	
<p>I live in the direct area impacted. I do not think the cycle route is necessary and don't believe it will be highly utilised enough. There are many off road</p>	

<p>routes that can be used and cyclist (of which I am one) should be able to cycle on these roads without the need of additional work.</p> <p>Do not agree with loosing grass verges and trees.</p> <p>I do agree with the double yellow lines on Rotherhithe street, salter road, red riff road.</p>	
<p>Whilst I accept the proposals may well enable the C10 bus route along Rotherhithe Street to flow more easily there are a number of aspects to the proposals that are negative and I strongly oppose as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Segregated cycle lanes only serve to make the roads appear more cluttered, more "concrete" / built up and less green. They are unsightly. 2. I strongly object to the proposed loss of existing mature trees. It is not adequate replacing them with new, young, small trees. 3. The proposed controlled parking zones along Rotherhithe Street will serve merely to cause residents to park there cars elsewhere, in already congested streets, thereby causing parking problems and hardship for other residents. 	
<p>I do not support the removal of existing trees.</p>	
<p>Overall I support, however, I strongly object to the</p>	

<p>removal of mature trees. I believe mature trees should be left in place as these really can't be replaced with new young trees. Please avoid doing this.</p>	
<p>Absolutely supporting.</p> <p>However I'd like to add these:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- traffic lights on Satler Rd-Rotherhithe Str. junction- railing on Holyoake Footpath where it leads out to Rotherhithe Street- Also I'd prefer to keep all the trees/bushes/verge as possible, and replant as much as possible to keep dust and noise in bay.	
<p>The overall summary includes the statement "15 trees removed with nine new trees proposed. Over the two projects there is an overall gain of five trees". This seems to imply that $-15 + 9 = +5$, obviously an absurdity. Please make these details more clear.</p>	
<p>I believe , the plans will cause more congestion due to narrowing of roads , i believe the loss of trees and grass verges is a travesty</p> <p>The community is generally satisfied with living here, these proposals will cause friction without a doubt</p>	

I strongly support the principles of your proposals but I encourage you to be more aspirational with design. I think your traffic engineers need to listen more to an urban designer and a landscape architect. We need sustainable drainage and mature trees!

There should be no reduction in carriageway width for motor vehicles.

There should be no loss of trees, verges or bus lay-bys

There should be no loss of parking spaces.

There should be no introduction of CPZ.

Rotherhithe Street residents should not be penalised for over development of Canada Water in excess of recommended urban density.

In principal I support making streets better for cyclists and pedestrians.

This should be integrated with Suds, good quality planting, more green..it is good for our mental health.

Also handy cycle racks near shops..not some inconvenient place all together up the road!

<p>Level crossings for pedestrians are a bit of a pain for cyclists..although suppose pedestrians should be the priority.</p> <p>Trees and planting help give the message to drive carefully, better than signs and bumps.</p> <p>Good quality paving always makes your walk more pleasant.</p>	
---	--

Filtered/closed/pedestrianised roads and stop rat runs	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I think there will need to be road closures to make parts of this access only otherwise we will see rat running making it unsafe for walking and cycling</p>	

Improved cyclist behaviours	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I am glad you are removing the one way systems I think it will help to make life pleasanter for those of us who do not have a car. But I am very concerned about the cycleways. I have great difficulty in seeing cyclists and they do not use bells anymore to let you know they are there. I also find that they cycle on the pavement even though there are cycle lanes available to them. I don't like the idea of the bus stops being in islands and my having to cross</p>	<p>Once works commence a public awareness programme will take place, explaining to local residents how these junction layout should used.</p> <p>In addition we will work with the police to ensure appropriate behaviour of those cyclists that contravene traffic offences</p>

<p>the road to get to them and when I get off them.</p>	
<p>My experience of cycling highways is fraught with the arrogance and reckless behaviour of the macho Lycra clad speedster who stops for nothing, red lights or pedestrians, Holland we are not. So whilst I support much of these plans it is with much apprehension.</p> <p>But I do appreciate the need for better traffic control, but remember the motorist pays a vast amount in taxes and should not be seen as the enemy. I myself (thanks to the freedom pass) only ever use my car to either carry goods for business or to leave London;</p> <p>something for which I will pay dearly for if and when the Mayor extends the ULEZ zone as my car is a classic that I have owned for 24yrs. and is only used to leave London to attend classic car meetings, Goodwood, Silverstone etc.</p>	

Improved junctions and/or traffic lights designs and phasing	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Being both a cyclist and motorist in this area I support the proposals, but am concerned with the number of new traffic lights proposed. Traffic flow is very good and the road area wide for both cyclists and motorists. These proposals will reduce traffic</p>	<p>The existing roundabout caters for motorised traffic,, however, roundabouts do not always cater for the needs of all road users such as cyclists and pedestrians.</p>

<p>flow due to the extra 2 traffic lights and the narrowing of the road and also reduce parking space at the same time.</p>	<p>The provision of traffic signals allows us to provide crossing across each arm of the junctions. The demands would be dependant on pedestrian use.</p>
<p>Additional set of traffic lights unnecessary and will cause more traffic adding noise and inconvenience to residents</p>	<p>The provisions of the traffic signals also allow us to design safer and easier access and egress to the cycle route, which is not possible with roundabout control.</p>
<p>The cycle route is in the wrong place. Traffic lights will slow up traffic which already backs-up enough.</p> <p>Apart for a few zebra crossings and some double yellow lines this is little to benefit those who live here. It is all about those coming into the area.</p> <p>It is as if the whole project is for cyclists. Is it?</p> <p>Put the money into something really useful like the bridge.</p> <p>Improve transport links on the buses and tubes, before you increase the population with the Canada Water development. Local residents were promised that there would be no problems, because all would be sorted out by cross-rail and the new bridge.</p> <p>Were we lied too?</p>	
<p>Building a cycle way on redriff road makes absolutely no sense for the following reasons:</p> <p>- there is a cycle way through surrey docks sports</p>	

<p>ground that is MUCH safer and MUCH more enjoyable (this is what I take if I need to go into central london);</p> <p>- there are very few cyclist on redriff road, this is a huge waste of money; money should be instead focused on area that are NOT on or close to the road (such as the surrey docks sports ground).</p> <p>Finally, adding traffic lights in lieu of roundabouts WILL create more pollution: the traffic there is low so adding places where cars and motorbikes will be idling does not make sense.</p>	
<p>I strongly support the proposals, despite some minor issues. The main issues are:</p> <p>I would like to see early release green lights for cycles at every signalised junction.</p> <p>The "camden kerb" on the bridge next to Omega Gate does not provide sufficient visual distinction between the cycling surface and walking surface. The level of the cycle track should be lower than the footpath.</p> <p>Rotherhithe Street is not sufficiently traffic-calmed modal filters should along Rotherhithe Street so that resident access is maintained while preventing through traffic for all modes other than buses and</p>	<p>Early release signals are proposed at, Surrey Quays Road and Quebec Way junctions. Presently this is not proposed at Deal Porters Way junction this will be explored at the detailed design stage with TfL.</p>

<p>cycles.</p> <p>"Sinusoidal" speed humps would be preferable on Rotherhithe Street, even if they incorporate a flat top. The humps should not be made of paving stones or any other material which becomes difficult to ride over with age and wear. Perhaps they should be made of asphalt, so that the surface is more elastic and easy to repair.</p>	
<p>Starts off pretty good nearer Lower Road. Good level of protection/segregation. Great stuff. Minor junctions need a bit of work to better protect people on bikes from being hit by turning vehicles (i.e. turning radii are left too wide so left turning drivers don't have a clear view of cyclist approaching from 'behind' them). The junction with Rotherhithe Street is a mess. Far too complex/cumbersome, and turning radius for motor vehicles is far too wide - encouraging high speed. On Rotherhithe Street itself people on bikes are just dumped in the highway to fend for themselves. Segregation disappears. Really poor show. If you're asking people on bikes to share the highway with motor vehicles you need to make sure there is sufficient filtered permeability to keep traffic speeds and volumes very low. This scheme fails to do that on Rotherhithe Street.</p>	<p>Following feed back we are amending the design of the Salter Road \ Rotherhithe St junction we are looking at ways of making it less complicated and reducing the speed of traffic , particularly those turning into Rotherhithe Street.</p> <p>Initial designs for this location investigated traffic signals, roundabout and the layout consulted on, overall it was considered that a priority junction was most appropriate.</p>
<p>Absolutely supporting.</p> <p>However I'd like to add these:</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - traffic lights on Satler Rd-Rotherhithe Str. junction - railing on Holyoake Footpath where it leads out to Rotherhithe Street - Also I'd prefer to keep all the trees/bushes/verge as possible, and replant as much as possible to keep dust and noise in bay. 	
<p>I support some aspects of these proposal [ie restricting parking to prevent the existing grid locks] ... but oppose others such as traffic lights and speed humps.</p> <p>You must look at parking along the whole of Rotherhithe Street from the Youth hostel to Salter Road.</p> <p>You must also look at the road layout at the tunnel entrance and create a slip road to permit vehicles and buses from Jamaica Road to turn in to Brunel Road and the Rotherhithe Peninsula.</p> <p>The bus lane leading to the tunnel mouth from Bermondsey has no purpose if buses get stuck in the grid lock at the tunnel mouth.</p>	<p>The Rotherhithe Tunnel junction is the responsibility of TfL. Who are currently carrying out works at this location. The proposals attempt to improve lane discipline and attempt to keep clear the junction. Ultimately the tunnel capacity is often exceeded, which will cause the junction to become blocked.</p>
<p>I oppose commingling cyclist crossing point with pedestrian zebra crossings. These two should be kept separate and a cyclist crossing should not</p>	<p>A cyclist having priority across a side road is no different than the existing road layout, vehicles turning in or out of any of the side road along</p>

<p>have priority over cars driving on Salter Road / Redriff Road.</p> <p>The proposed scheme is too complex and not commensurate with the low number of cyclists in the area.</p> <p>The proposed scheme will lead to loss of trees and increase in travel times, traffic and pollution due to removal of mini-roundabouts and introduction of new cycle crossings.</p>	<p>Redriff Road and Salter Road, would be expected to give way to cyclists on those roads. The only difference it that the cycleway has two way flow on the segregated facility</p>
---	---

Improved public transport (reliability, more & direct routes, accessibility, overcrowding)	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Overall I love the proposals but the loss of bus stop lay-bys will generate unacceptable levels of congestion every time a bus stops. They need to be re-instated into the plans.</p> <p>The Surrey Docks Farm and Community Centre generate a lot of car parking and the double yellow parking restrictions around these sites are insufficient to resolve this problem</p>	<p>The proposed bus stop layout is common to the vast majority of stops in Southwark\London. The bus stopping in the carriageway allows the bus to move once all passengers have boarded or alighted, without causing any undue delay to other road users.</p>
<p>A positive move, but one which will only realise its full potential if improvements are made to the Rotherhithe-Canary Wharf link. This initiative needs to be directly linked to that else it will potentially be a white elephant.</p>	

<p>I do have concerns at the removal of the bus lay-bys on Redriff Road and the effect this will have on the movement of traffic in the proposal generally. In an ideal world i would have no issue but as a cyclist I recognise that frustrated drivers can be dangerous drivers.</p> <p>The double yellows in Rotherhithe Street are a really positive move. Parking on both sides is an issue for bus and lorry traffic especially when wide vans are parked. That said, the plan should include provision for where the displaced cars and vans will park?</p>	
<p>I am glad you are removing the one way systems I think it will help to make life pleasanter for those of us who do not have a car. But I am very concerned about the cycleways. I have great difficulty in seeing cyclists and they do not use bells anymore to let you know they are there. I also find that they cycle on the pavement even though there are cycle lanes available to them. I don't like the idea of the bus stops being in islands and my having to cross the road to get to them and when I get off them.</p>	<p>The vast majority of the proposed cycleway is segregated from the footway, which cyclists are more likely to use than the footway.</p> <p>At the bus stops raised zebra crossings are provided to assist pedestrians to the footway</p>
<p>The separate dual cycle way is not necessary. I cycle both Salter road and Rotherhithe street every day and can tell from experience is it not needed. What we need it to slow down the traffic on both these roads, and facilitate traffic with more double yellow lines on Rotherhithe street, so that the c10</p>	<p>The proposals on Rotherhithe Street will greatly assist the C10 bus route with the installation of double yellow lines and permit bays on one side only. The use of Rotherhithe Street provides significant benefit for those living on Rotherhithe Street, particularly those that may have mobility</p>

<p>bus can easily circulate.</p>	<p>difficulties</p>
<p>Strongly support the segregated cycleway along redriff road, though it will be a shame to lose lots of the green feel the road currently has (though it will be greener in another way). The proposals for rotherhithe street aren't as encouraging.</p> <p>In general, I'm not sure why the C10 has to go through Rotherhithe street at all and why it can't go along Salter/Redriff road like the 381? There are plenty of cutways through between these roads and this would make having a segregated cycleway along rotherhithe street far easier to implement which would be much more attractive if the Peckham/rotherhithe route is really going to take off especially if the free ferry service happens. Surely this would also significantly increase C10 bus times through the area.</p>	
<p>Whilst I accept the proposals may well enable the C10 bus route along Rotherhithe Street to flow more easily there are a number of aspects to the proposals that are negative and I strongly oppose as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Segregated cycle lanes only serve to make the roads appear more cluttered, more "concrete" / built up and less green. They are unsightly. 2. I strongly object to the proposed loss of existing 	

<p>mature trees. It is not adequate replacing them with new, young, small trees.</p> <p>3. The proposed controlled parking zones along Rotherhithe Street will serve merely to cause residents to park their cars elsewhere, in already congested streets, thereby causing parking problems and hardship for other residents.</p>	
<p>These changes should help decrease traffic speeds, without hopefully adversely affecting the buses, and encourage cyclists and walkers, and reduce noise and improve air quality with a bit of luck!</p>	<p>The positives for buses is that they will now be able to pull away from bus stops as they will be generally in the traffic lane and not having to pull out into that lane from a lay-by. The provision of double yellow lines will improve buses flow and not unduly delayed by parked vehicles. Buses will be slightly effected by the proposed traffic signals, but as these will not be at capacity, they would not be significantly effected</p>
<p>There's a lot in here for cyclists, but not much for those who travel by public transport. It's hard to see how bus reliability will be positively affected. It's bad enough already.</p>	
<p>The amount of cyclists on this route is low, as the peninsula is a dead end and so used only by residents.</p> <p>There are already alternative off-road routes to Canada Water via Russia Dock Wood etc. or the bridge over Salter Road from Rotherhithe Street. It would be safer and more pleasant for cyclists to cycle towards Canada Water through RDW rather than slowing private and public transport getting to the peninsula - which is already a long way from public transport hubs and will only slow bus</p>	

journeys to Canada Water and Rotherhithe stations.

The requirements of cyclists (many of whom are passing through from Lewisham and Greenwich) seem to be constantly put ahead of locals , particularly at the expense of the elderly and disabled who rely on buses .

It is vital that bus routes are kept clear to enable buses to run at a decent speed and to for the frequency to be reliable . Restricting these routes will increase pollution due to traffic jams .

You do a disservice to cyclists by encouraging them onto bus routes and major thoroughfares alongside the vehicles most likely to kill them . Even if they have segregated lanes they will need to cross junctions where they risk their lives .

A more creative solution using parks , river walks or side streets would be far more appropriate.

The popularity of the cycle routes through the former bricklayers arms railway depot and along Williw walk show just how popular these routes can be when placed properly through residential streets away from polluting heavy vehicles that might kill them .

<p>The first time a cyclist dies on Jamaica road or Redriff road as they cross a junction out of the cycle lane , it will be perfectly correct that Southwark should be questioned as to why cyclists were encouraged to be on such busy roads</p>	
<p>As a bus user, I am very worried about this scheme - primarily about the slow speeds which will ensue during the roadworks to build this scheme, which will mean that Rotherhithe will be difficult to get to by bus (the only options are 381 or C10 along Redriff Road, or 381 or C10 along Jamaica Road, which is also clogged with cycle friendly roadworks). The lane narrowing will also make it difficult when two large vehicles such as lorries or buses meet in opposite directions, further slowing progress.</p> <p>Many residents of this area do not have the ability to cycle, and it is not a perfect solution for everyone - Rotherhithe is a peninsula bounded on 3 sides by water, with poor transport links to the east, north and west - and therefore is much more insular than other areas in Southwark. Therefore, the two bus services that provide a bus service to the peninsula are invaluable as they are the only two affordable means of public transport for the vast majority of people not in walking distance of Rotherhithe, Canada Water and Surrey Quays stations.</p> <p>I feel that the loss of green space along Redriff</p>	<p>Road works can cause delays to all road users, we will plan these as carefully as possible to minimise there effects</p>

Road and Salter Road will also make the community poorer - as this green space will inevitably be replaced with grey tarmac, causing much more visual pollution and detracting from the area. It will also cause higher potential for traffic (both cars and bikes) to hit pedestrians, as these verges provide separation between vehicles and pedestrians.

In my opinion, Southwark Council should do two things - firstly improve the existing cycle tracks through the Russia Dock Woodland by providing clearer markings, a smoother surface for cyclists, better lighting and improved links to connect to the woodland (at the moment, cyclists have to dismount and cycle up/down a hill to get to the woodland proper). There are many places where the woodland meets Redriff Road and Salter Road - if these connections were improved, many more people would use these cycle paths.

Secondly, they should introduce some scheme to slow traffic down that is using the Rotherhithe peninsula - potentially along the lines of an average speed camera system. I agree that cars do routinely use this road at an unsafe speed - however, narrowing the road is not going to stop reckless driving, just endanger local people. Also, they should consider how cars enter Deal Porters Way - at busy times it can be hard to enter the

<p>peninsula with two lanes of traffic - with only one it will disproportionately affect local people with traffic caused by users of the shopping centre.</p>	
<p>I support some aspects of these proposal [ie restricting parking to prevent the existing grid locks] ... but oppose others such as traffic lights and speed humps.</p> <p>You must look at parking along the whole of Rotherhithe Street from the Youth hostel to Salter Road.</p> <p>You must also look at the road layout at the tunnel entrance and create a slip road to permit vehicles and buses from Jamaica Road to turn in to Brunel Road and the Rotherhithe Peninsula.</p> <p>The bus lane leading to the tunnel mouth from Bermondsey has no purpose if buses get stuck in the grid lock at the tunnel mouth.</p>	<p>As part of the current TfL proposals at this location a bus gate is proposed to assist buses to get to the head of junction</p>
<p>Lower road is a major traffic through-route south of the river, with no reasonable alternative. This route already gets congested and this congestion is slowly getting worse. The priority of any road changes should surely be to reduce the road congestion. The volume of motor vehicles, I expect, would outnumber bicycles by at least 1,000-to-1. The priority should be the majority, not a few people who happen to be today's political fad.</p>	

The cycle route along Redriff Road looks like no more than someone's personal pet project born out of a stupid idea. The benefits do not appear, to me, to justify the cost of implementation, the disruption to the area, and the worsening of an already congested part of London.

What plans are there to undo all of the changes, and what funds are being held back to do this, should the whole thing turn out to be a congestion disaster? Whose idea is the whole thing and will they resign if the expected congestion disaster unfolds?

When is the long-proposed footbridge from Rotherhithe to the Isle of Dogs materialising? Have Thames Clippers successfully lobbied against it?

Money would far better be spent by extending the Jubilee Line from Canada Water along to Greenwich to connect to the DLR and on to the O2, with 2-3 stations in-between. The area from Surrey Quays to Greenwich, once a commercial area and now mostly a modern residential area, has zero public transport other than busses, from Surrey Quays all the way to Greenwich. This is a planning cock-up of the highest order.

The cycle route is in the wrong place. Traffic lights will slow up traffic which already backs-up enough.

<p>Apart for a few zebra crossings and some double yellow lines this is little to benefit those who live here. It is all about those coming into the area.</p> <p>It is as if the whole project is for cyclists. Is it?</p> <p>Put the money into something really useful like the bridge.</p> <p>Improve transport links on the buses and tubes, before you increase the population with the Canada Water development. Local residents were promised that there would be no problems, because all would be sorted out by cross-rail and the new bridge.</p> <p>Were we lied too?</p>	
<p>Removal of westbound bus stops should be avoided.</p>	<p>To provide a segregated cycle route, bus stops are designed to be on the main carriageway with the cycleway behind the bus stop. At this location this has not been possible, as we wanted to minimise the effect on the tress on the opposite side of the road.</p> <p>The diagram above shows the existing stops circled in red. The spacing between the bus stop will now be 520, we have looked at trying to reduce this distance by moving these stops but this isn't feasible.</p>

More and safer cycle infrastructure/ routes

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>It is ridiculous that the scheme doesn't extend around the peninsula. Rotherhithe Street needs a segregated cycle lane.</p> <p>NCR 425 and Quietway 14 are not fit for purpose. There are barriers to cycling throughout the network. Further, there is no protection from cars on the shared portions.</p>	<p>The council is currently investigating speed reduction measures along the remaining part of Salter Road, these proposals will include measure for cyclists taking into account these proposals</p>
<p>Great to see the Council promoting safer cycling routes. Would like to see them go even further to reduce speeding on Salter Road. Segregated cycle ways are essential to give more people the confidence to get on their bikes. Why no proposals to improve cycling facilities on the North side of the peninsula on Salter Road?</p>	
<p>The plans to include Rotherhithe Street into the route are ridiculous!! Salter Road is much more veasable, safer and causes less disruption. There is much more open space on Salter Road, whereas Rotherhithe Street is already cramped!</p>	
<p>Why stop at Acorn walk, and not cease the opportunity to extend this all the way around Rotherhithe Street and Salter Road, back to the Rotherhithe Tunnel roundabout?</p>	
<p>While I strongly support these proposals, it is very disappointing the segregated cycleway doesn't</p>	

<p>extend all the way around the peninsula. Speeding is a major problem on Brunel Road/Salter Road around Rotherhithe Station - what is being done to address that?</p>	
<p>The plans for segregated cycling and restricted parking are excellent. But there should be segregated cycling the whole way!</p>	
<p>New, safe cycleways are always a welcome addition to streets, although this scheme seems to connect to the location of the proposed crossing to Canary Wharf which has for now been cancelled. The scheme should continue as soon as possible on the other half of the Rotherhithe peninsula to connect with the roundabout and the CS4.</p> <p>Redriff Road is very wide, including a median, and the loss of many trees seems unnecessary. Cycling and greening should go together and not put in conflict. Space for cycling infrastructure should be taken from vehicular lanes.</p> <p>The proposals for Rotherhithe Street do not address the issues, leaving most roadspace for parking and forcing cyclists to stop for oncoming vehicles and to move from one side of the carriageway to the other to avoid cars moving and parked.</p>	
<p>cycle path should continue all around Salter/Rotherhithe Road to the Rotherhithe Station .</p>	

<p>There is currently no reason for traffic towards the Hilton ferry.</p> <p>the traffic is rather out from this area into central London (west), not east into Canary wharf</p>	
<p>Strongly oppose the cycle lane disrupting Rotherhithe Street, IT can continue on Salter Road with little disruption.</p>	
<p>The proposals are strongly supported; however, I would also appreciate seeing the plans extended to the whole way around Salter Road back to the Rotherhithe Tunnel</p>	
<p>I strongly support better cycle facilities. However, i don't quite understand the logic of the cycle route ending where it does on rotherhite street. It would entirely make sense were a bridge to Canary Wharf to be built. It would make better sense to either continue the path around the peninsular to rotherhite station or not bother at all.</p>	
<p>I would prefer a segregated cycleway the entire length if possible. Will be important for the cycleway to link safely with paths into the russia dock woodland.</p>	
<p>The implementation of the Rotherhithe Cycleway is welcome, as it provides safe, dedicated infrastructure for cyclists.</p>	

<p>It is unclear what happens with the cycleway on Salter Road to the north of the Rotherhithe Street junction. With the CPZ banning parking, there is a missed opportunity to at least continue with a mandatory cycle lane along Salter Road to provide some protection for cyclists.</p> <p>We welcome the two new zebras at Salter Road/Rotherhithe Street - these are badly needed.</p>	
<p>Rotherhithe Street could see more improvements: less car parking, painted cycle lanes, orca/turtle segregated cycle lanes, but it is a good start! Hope to see the other side (from the Tunnel to Acorn Walk past Rotherhithe Overground Station will be tackled as well.</p>	
<p>The requirements of cyclists (many of whom are passing through from Lewisham and Greenwich) seem to be constantly put ahead of locals , particularly at the expense of the elderly and disabled who rely on buses .</p> <p>It is vital that bus routes are kept clear to enable buses to run at a decent speed and to for the frequency to be reliable . Restricting these routes will increase pollution due to traffic jams .</p> <p>You do a disservice to cyclists by encouraging them onto bus routes and major thoroughfares alongside the vehicles most likely to kill them . Even if they</p>	

<p>have segregated lanes they will need to cross junctions where they risk their lives .</p> <p>A more creative solution using parks , river walks or side streets would be far more appropriate.</p> <p>The popularity of the cycle routes through the former bricklayers arms railway depot and along Williw walk show just how popular these routes can be when placed properly through residential streets away from polluting heavy vehicles that might kill them .</p> <p>The first time a cyclist dies on Jamaica road or Redriff road as they cross a junction out of the cycle lane , it will be perfectly correct that Southwark should be questioned as to why cyclists were encouraged to be on such busy roads</p>	
<p>We need more speed bumps to stop speeding and definitely more cycling paths.</p>	
<p>more cycleways please</p>	
<p>The city needs become more cycle friendly. A lot of the times there are no cycle lanes or routes at all, and if there are, they are badly built. The air quality needs to go up so we need to get more people cycling or walking.</p>	
<p>We need protected bike lanes so that anyone aged 8-80 feels safe and is safe to get onto 2 wheels. More people cycling for everyday local journeys is</p>	

essential to improve air quality, lower pollution, lower the number of road crashes, get more people active and therefore tackle the obesity crisis which is threatening to bankrupt the NHS	
more cycleways please	
The city needs become more cycle friendly. A lot of the times there are no cycle lanes or routes at all, and if there are, they are badly built. The air quality needs to go up so we need to get more people cycling or walking.	
We need protected bike lanes so that anyone aged 8-80 feels safe and is safe to get onto 2 wheels. More people cycling for everyday local journeys is essential to improve air quality, lower pollution, lower the number of road crashes, get more people active and therefore tackle the obesity crisis which is threatening to bankrupt the NHS	
There should be more places to cycle around London.	
I am a cyclist in the area and I would love to see more cycle routes, I am very scared to cycle on the roads and would strongly support dedicated cycle routes. It will be saver and better for the environment	
Cyclists need to feel safe. I cycle in London everyday and it's Extremely dangerous at times. Londoners deserve safer roads and cleaner air.	
In principal I support making streets better for	

cyclists and pedestrians.

This should be integrated with Suds, good quality planting, more green..it is good for our mental health.

Also handy cycle racks near shops..not some inconvenient place all together up the road!

Level crossings for pedestrians are a bit of a pain for cyclists..although suppose pedestrians should be the priority.

Trees and planting help give the message to drive carefully, better than signs and bumps.

Good quality paving always makes your walk more pleasant.

I regularly commute by bike from Streatham to canary wharf. There is currently no route that is particularly safe or pleasant - I would be really keen to use this route via ferry if it were implemented.

My only other comment is that it would be great to see more routes that make it more feasible to cycle or walk for local journeys (as well as commuting) as this would help reduce the number of short distance car journeys.

I want a safe route for cycling from Greenwich /

Woolwich to Wapping	
<p>Overall very good, however as the Rotherhithe Street section doesn't have any segregated tracks it would be nice to see some traffic reduction measures which ensure through traffic takes Salter Road instead of Rotherhithe Street</p>	<p>Rotherhithe Street is used predominately by local traffic and is not considered to be taking rat-running traffic. So any filtered permeability would most likely not displace traffic. As Salter Road is the only road alternative and is considered most likely to be a route traffic would choice to use</p>
<p>Starts off pretty good nearer Lower Road. Good level of protection/segregation. Great stuff. Minor junctions need a bit of work to better protect people on bikes from being hit by turning vehicles (i.e. turning radii are left too wide so left turning drivers don't have a clear view of cyclist approaching from 'behind' them). The junction with Rotherhithe Street is a mess. Far too complex/cumbersome, and turning radius for motor vehicles is far too wide - encouraging high speed. On Rotherhithe Street itself people on bikes are just dumped in the highway to fend for themselves. Segregation disappears. Really poor show. If you're asking people on bikes to share the highway with motor vehicles you need to make sure there is sufficient filtered permeability to keep traffic speeds and volumes very low. This scheme fails to do that on Rotherhithe Street.</p>	
<p>Fully support the creation of the rotherhithe cycleway..</p> <p>It will make cycling much much safer in the area. It will link destinations which cyclists want to travel to.</p>	<p>Southwark, design guide does not promote the use of coloured surfacing.</p> <p>Flat top humps have been proposed along Rotherhithe Street as it a bus route and passenger and driver comfort is considered important at this</p>

<p>It will slow down speeding motor traffic.</p> <p>However, please consider these 2 points:</p> <p>1) Colour-dyed tarmac on parallel crossings, and where the cycleway crosses side roads at non-signalised junctions. This will subtly communicate to drivers that the carriageway space as the crossing is not an ordinary piece of road carriageway but is in fact a cycleway crossing the path of motor vehicles, where drivers must give way to cyclists. This will hugely improve safety - I have seen many collisions at parallel crossings because drivers are not trained to look for cyclists and are unfamiliar with how the crossing works. The crossing design needs to have subtle visual clues indicating that the cycleway crossing is not a normal piece of carriageway - colored tarmac is the best way to do this. See Waltham Forest Borough Lea Bridge Road for red-dyed tarmac cycleways as a good example of how to do it right. Also see TfL plans for Cycleway 4 on Jamaica Road, where tarmac is a blue colour where cycleway crosses side roads.</p> <p>2) Sinusoidal speed bumps instead of flat tops on Rotherhithe Street. Sinusoidal bumps slow motor vehicles far, far more effectively, and are much safer and more comfortable to cycle across. Southwark Council already uses sinusoidal bumps</p>	<p>location. Non bus routes we would use Sinusoidal humps</p> <p>The Camden kerb is being used around structures where the design has affected our ability to provide a full segregation. Improved footway will reinforce the difference between the footway and the cycleway and encourage both pedestrians and cyclist to use there area. There will be a change in footway material will provide clear visual distinction from cycleway</p>
--	--

on Ivydale Road in Nunhead - they are fantastic for slowing down traffic on that road, and comfortable to cycle across. Why not use them here on Rotherhithe Street too?

I strongly support the proposals, despite some minor issues. The main issues are:

I would like to see early release green lights for cycles at every signalised junction.

The "camden kerb" on the bridge next to Onega Gate does not provide sufficient visual distinction between the cycling surface and walking surface. The level of the cycle track should be lower than the footpath.

Rotherhithe Street is not sufficiently traffic-calmed modal filters should along Rotherhithe Street so that resident access is maintained while preventing through traffic for all modes other than buses and cycles.

"Sinusoidal" speed humps would be preferable on Rotherhithe Street, even if they incorporate a flat top. The humps should not be made of paving stones or any other material which becomes difficult to ride over with age and wear. Perhaps they should be made of asphalt, so that the surface is more elastic and easy to repair.

<p>I strongly oppose because you have failed to provide the Surrey Quays to Peckham cycleway west of A200 and that must be a priority now the bridge is not being built. It should all be delivered at the same time. I think it is terrible to remove zebra crossings on some roads to help traffic dominate while providing new zebra crossing on other roads nearby. It is double standards and deeply unfair. It is always about the peninsula and not about west of A200. And I am fed up with that.</p>	<p>The route has been split into three sections, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. north of Lower Road 2. between Lower Road and Old Kent Road 3. south of Old Kent Road <p>This sections alignment was relatively straight forward and has therefore been developed earlier. We are currently assessing the quality of potential alignments south of Lower Road, once an alignment is chosen a design will be developed for consultation</p>
---	--

No controlled parking	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Overall I love the proposals but the loss of bus stop lay-bys will generate unacceptable levels of congestion every time a bus stops. They need to be re-instated into the plans.</p> <p>The Surrey Docks Farm and Community Centre generate a lot of car parking and the double yellow parking restrictions around these sites are insufficient to resolve this problem</p>	<p>We will also investigate implementing some short stay bays around this area.</p>
<p>The cycle highway is good in general but I think you've overlooked the routes that pedestrians use and how cars drive along some of these routes. It could be made safer.</p>	<p>Controlled parking zones (CPZs) are the most effective way that the council can manage kerbside space. If all new developments had enough parking for all residents, traffic in the area would increase</p>

Can you please consider bringing back the proposed bridge that was scrapped? My work is directly opposite this area on the river but to get there by bike, I'd have to cycle all the way into zone 1 and back out again, through all the pollution and more risk of accident.

With regards to the controlled parking:

The docklands is a lovely residential area and there are never any issues with on street parking. A controlled parking zone is ridiculous.

There are never any issues parking on our street and I can't believe you are turning such a lovely, residential area of London into a controlled parking zone that will completely ruin the streets. Why can't you make all of the new builds provide parking in the building rather than the council paying to implement controlled parking everywhere. It's a waste of council money when the private builders can provide parking within the development.

The docklands is a lovely peaceful area with no issues around parking. I lived in an area with controlled parking previously and it was a nightmare, especially when trying to get visitor permits and I could only obtain them from the council office in The Blue which was only open

as would air pollution. Southwark Council's Movement Plan encourages more sustainable modes of travel.

<p>when I was at work and was nowhere near my home or workplace.</p> <p>Please do not enforce restrictions in an area area that doesn't need it. The docklands are nowhere near the new Canada Water plan. Is it 100% certain that the Canada Water Plan will go ahead anyway? You've already scrapped the much need bridge proposal that was needed so badly!</p> <p>Have you walked around the docklands to see how easy it is to park and how little cars there are? It feels like a money making scheme to me.</p>	
<p>Don't understand the need for the full CPZ or cycleway</p>	
<p>There should be no reduction in carriageway width for motor vehicles.</p> <p>There should be no loss of trees, verges or bus lay-bys</p> <p>There should be no loss of parking spaces.</p> <p>There should be no introduction of CPZ.</p> <p>Rotherhithe Street residents should not be penalised for over development of Canada Water in excess of recommended urban density.</p>	
<p>There is no need for cycle lanes. The roads are</p>	<p>Controlled parking zones are effective at reducing</p>

<p>wide, suburban style, leafy and quiet. This will waste tax payers money and make roads less safe for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users.</p> <p>Please do not disrupt our quiet residential area with all these road works and disruptions for no reason!</p> <p>There are a few areas that could be improved with some better road crossings</p> <p>Please listen carefully to Rotherhithe street residents re parking, as the current plans are insufficient for all the cars that park there and this whole plan looks like a way of taxing residents as that street is seldom used by non-residents so parking bays seem unnecessary</p>	<p>the amount of cars parked in an area. We rarely receive complaints from those living in a CPZ that they cannot find a space to park</p>
<p>I live in the direct area impacted. I do not think the cycle route is necessary and don't believe it will be highly utilised enough. There are many off road routes that can be used and cyclist (of which I am one) should be able to cycle on these roads without the need of additional work.</p> <p>Do not agree with loosing grass verges and trees.</p> <p>I do agree with the double yellow lines on Rotherhithe street, salter road, red riff road.</p>	<p></p>
<p>There need to be more speed restrictions on Redriff/Salter Road. More speed cameras.</p>	

<p>I don't agree with the yellow lines. Let cars park there - it will slow down the traffic</p> <p>Please don't remove that speed camera. It has saved lives!</p>	
<p>Whilst I accept the proposals may well enable the C10 bus route along Rotherhithe Street to flow more easily there are a number of aspects to the proposals that are negative and I strongly oppose as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Segregated cycle lanes only serve to make the roads appear more cluttered, more "concrete" / built up and less green. They are unsightly. 2. I strongly object to the proposed loss of existing mature trees. It is not adequate replacing them with new, young, small trees. 3. The proposed controlled parking zones along Rotherhithe Street will serve merely to cause residents to park their cars elsewhere, in already congested streets, thereby causing parking problems and hardship for other residents. 	<p>Controlled parking zones (CPZs) are the most effective way that the council can manage kerbside space. If all new developments had enough parking for all residents, traffic in the area would increase as would air pollution. Southwark Council's Movement Plan encourages more sustainable modes of travel.</p>

Noise reduction

Comments and or suggestions	Response
These changes should help decrease traffic speeds, without hopefully adversely affecting the buses, and encourage cyclists and walkers, and reduce noise and improve air quality with a bit of luck!	

Other	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Comments on Rotherhithe Street insufficient facilities	
overall support, except when cycle provision is just paint with parking spaces on the sides.	The proposals along Rotherhithe Street take into account the needs of cyclist, bus and residents parking. There is insufficient space to provide cycle lanes or segregation.
Rotherhithe Street could see more improvements: less car parking, painted cycle lanes, orca/turtle segregated cycle lanes, but it is a good start! Hope to see the other side (from the Tunnel to Acorn Walk past Rotherhithe Overground Station will be tackled as well.	
General comments	
Overall on street parking around Rotherhithe is a mess and makes most of Rotherhithe street effectively one way. I support these proposals but also think that would synergize well with a more affordable RB4 service.	
Ban diesel.	
Overall the speed and volume of vehicle traffic is	

<p>unacceptable on Lower road , especially when there is a millwall football match. Vehicles at present intimidate pedestrians and cyclists alike by speeding up on the one way section of Lower Road, once they have passed the Lower road gyratory. Businesses on Lower Road currently suffer by the segregation caused by speeding hostile traffic. More safe crossings with enhanced landscaping, including more secure cycle racks are essential.</p>	
<p>Needs to be safer for people to use by foot or bicycle.</p>	
<p>Making sure the cycle paths are connected and don't just stop is crucial. There's nothing more dangerous than a cycle lane suddenly stopping on a busy road</p>	
<p>I'd like to see an improvement not just in cycle infrastructure but in the built environment in general.</p> <p>Let's have ramp & lift combinations rather than stairs & lift. If you use a ramp & lift combination and the lift goes out of service, everyone can still use the ramp. If the lift goes out of service in a stairs & lift combination, the stairs form an impassable barrier to many people; eg, people with pushchairs, people with bikes and e-bikes, wheelchair users.</p>	

<p>Let's have as few curbs as possible. Use tactile paving instead of curbs to demarcate the border between the road and the pavement (dotted for preference rather than corrugated).</p> <p>If, for any reason, curbs have to be used, then those curbs should be bevelled. Non-bevelled curbs are a extreme danger to cyclists. Please also ensure that all the curbs are cut in front of trees, which are planted along the roadside, so that rainwater can get in and around them. You might be able to get some funding from Thames Water to help with this.</p>	
<p>Support for proposal</p>	
<p>This will make the area more liveable.</p>	
<p>This is generally a very good and thorough proposal that would improve life for people using all modes of transport around the borough.</p>	
<p>Really positive proposals that should help people get out on their bikes more often.</p>	
<p>The proposals may upset some motorists but if we are going to tackle air pollution, climate change, and help people live more healthily, you have to take some tough decisions. Overall, I would describe these plans as visionary.</p>	
<p>These proposals will hugely benefit the area - most of this area covered in the plans I would not dare to cycle in due to the dangers posed by the current</p>	

<p>road layout, and the dominance of motor vehicles. In the current climate emergency we are facing, these plans will surely make cycling and walking far more accessible, safer and enjoyable - which will take many unnecessary vehicles off the road.</p>	
<p>Wonderful, many thanks!! Our area needs more of this.</p>	
<p>This is an absolutely fantastic proposal. I support it in the strongest possible terms. It will encourage people onto their bikes, not just in the immediate area but around the borough and beyond. This will improve air quality, decrease the city's carbon footprint, and improve residents' health.</p>	
<p>This will have a major positive improvement on people walking and cycling. Very much appreciated. It will make the area more attractive and will improve health and wellbeing of the residents. A better connection with Southwark Park and a second entrance or exit for Surrey Quay station would be great.</p>	
<p>The modifications will give much needed improvement to the safety and ambience of the road, particularly for people on bicycle and on foot.</p>	
<p>some great proposals to allow more people to cycle in the area. Maybe more to deter motor traffic too could make it even better</p>	
<p>I strongly support the principles of your proposals but I encourage you to be more aspirational with design. I think your traffic engineers need to listen</p>	

<p>more to an urban designer and a landscape architect. We need sustainable drainage and mature trees!</p>	
<p>Very much in support of these proposals and hope they go ahead.</p>	
<p>Please see comments under each section of the proposal. Overall the scheme is good, but some small changes could make it great. I worry that some small issues could have a great impact on the number of new and not confident cyclists that could potentially use this route.</p>	
<p>Rotherhithe Tunnel junction</p>	
<p>I do oppose in particular creating two way street on Lower Road and introducing a segregated cycleway there.</p> <p>I also oppose the Rotherhite cycleway.</p> <p>The main traffic issue in Rotherhite is in my opinion the roundabout before the Rotherhite tunnel and the traffic jams caused by it. This should be addressed via a tunnel leading into Rotherhite tunnel that runs beneath the roundabout, so bypassing the roundabout. This would ease the most pressing traffic issue in the area and improve air quality there!</p> <p>This is much more important than some cosmetic cycleway measures...</p>	<p>The Rotherhithe Tunnel junction is the responsibility of TfL. Who are currently carrying out works at this location. The proposals attempt to improve lane discipline and attempt to keep clear the junction. Ultimately the tunnel capacity is often exceeded, which will cause the junction to become blocked</p>

Not supportive of proposals

This proposal is only going to make life harder for local community and make the area less safe and more polluted.

The whole scheme is totally unnecessary and will create huge difficulties for everybody in this large area, whether they are residents or those who are just passing through it.

The already very poor air quality will be made massively worse, and even those who choose to walk or the cyclists will be breathing in the most foul air imaginable. Thousands of people will be permanently inconvenienced, nothing will be able to move, even walking at 2.5mph will be considered as 'speeding', and the health of everyone affected by this total madness, will be seriously damaged.

Most of important of all - HOW MUCH IS ALL THIS MADNESS AND CHAOS GOING TO COST US TAXPAYERS?

I will make a prediction, and I am absolutely sure that it will be proved to be correct. My prediction is that the outcome of this "so-called" consultation will be that "83% of respondents strongly support the proposals". The reason I make this claim is because the outcome of every "consultation" I have ever participated in over many years has, without

exception, come up with the same result. Amazing isn't it? It is NEVER 68%, or 47% or 74% or indeed any other percentage, it is ALWAYS 83%. The reason for this is quite obvious to those of us with a living brain cell - THE WHOLE CONSULTATION IS A TOTAL SHAM!!! The Council and also the Mad Mayor of London are totally corrupt from top to bottom, and they make sure that they always get their own way with total disregard for the needs of the taxpaying public. They choose to ignore the facts that the slower the traffic moves, the worse the air pollution gets, also the more stress everyone suffers from the inconvenience and the time that is wasted, the frustration of being late for important appointments, and the risks that everyone takes in order to try to get to where they need to be on time.

It is quite obvious that the corrupt Council always makes sure all these proposals, (regardless of the subject, whether it be the highways, housing planning, transport etc), have already been passed by the Council, and will always go ahead regardless, and no doubt the contractors have already been decided, well in advance of any so-called "consultation" is ever put forward to the general public, who always have to pay for the nonsense, and always have to suffer the consequences of the outcome. TOTAL BONKERS AND UNSCRUPULOUS MADNESS.

Once again its families and tradespeople who need

<p>their vehicles that suffer. I'm fed up with the council and government being short sighted and only focusing on the cyclists and ageing population.</p>	
<p>The road layout seems to work well at the moment. I cannot see any real benefit to the changes. Redriff/Salter Road has good visibility with grass verges along most of its length making it already safe for pedestrians and cyclists. Also the road currently does not seem to have much traffic.</p> <p>This road is already one of the most pleasant and safe in the area, I just do not think that this scheme justifies the cost.</p>	
<p>I don't see any benefit, especially there are very few cyclists. Having cycle lane will only affect local residents</p>	
<p>The amount of cyclists on this route is low, as the peninsula is a dead end and so used only by residents.</p> <p>There are already alternative off-road routes to Canada Water via Russia Dock Wood etc. or the bridge over Salter Road from Rotherhithe Street. It would be safer and more pleasant for cyclists to cycle towards Canada Water through RDW rather than slowing private and public transport getting to the peninsula - which is already a long way from public transport hubs and will only slow bus journeys to Canada Water and Rotherhithe</p>	

stations.	
<p>My experience of cycling highways is fraught with the arrogance and reckless behaviour of the macho Lycra clad speedster who stops for nothing, red lights or pedestrians, Holland we are not. So whilst I support much of these plans it is with much apprehension.</p> <p>But I do appreciate the need for better traffic control, but remember the motorist pays a vast amount in taxes and should not be seen as the enemy. I myself (thanks to the freedom pass) only ever use my car to either carry goods for business or to leave London; something for which I will pay dearly for if and when the Mayor extends the ULEZ zone as my car is a classic that I have owned for 24yrs. and is only used to leave London to attend classic car meetings, Goodwood, Silverstone etc.</p>	
Relevant to Lower Road proposal	
<p>Please allow left turn from Lower road onto Plough way and right turn from Plough way to Lower Road. Otherwise you are making access very difficult for many people, including those beyond Southwark's borders as Plough Road links down to Cannon Wharf and on to Grove Street, both of which are in Deptford.</p>	
<p>4) CYCLING – The current plans do not make it easier for Cyclists to navigate the dangerous Lower Road, Rotherhithe New Road,</p>	

<p>Plough Way Crossroad from the proposed superhighway to get to Oldfield Grove for access to Quietway One. Due to the number of Cyclists that use Quietway One, I think this should be considered more important in the plans as it looks like this may make such manoeuvres more dangerous for cyclists.</p>	
<p>I strongly support the overall proposals, although the proposals for the route on Rotherhithe Street are disappointing.</p> <p>The only other concern I have is that the Council may see the Rotherhithe Cycleway as a replacement for the route that is part of NCN 425 (ie Cunard Walk, Brunswick Quay, Russia Dock Woodland). I believe that the two routes will have different roles, with the NCN 425 route remaining a popular walking/cycling route to local schools, as well as a leisure route, while the Rotherhithe cycleway will probably appeal more to commuters to Canary Wharf.</p>	<p>The Rotherhithe Cycleway links to the other cycle networks and by no means replaces them</p>
<p>Type of pedestrian crossings used</p>	
<p>I am disgusted that for the Rotherhithe Cycleway you are proposing to provide NEW ZEBRA CROSSINGS East of the A200 while in Rotherhithe Old Road, Rotherhithe New Road, Bestwood Street / Lower Road - West of the A200 - you are removing zebra crossings to increase flow of motor traffic. 150 cyclists at peak is not very many and</p>	<p>The choice of the type of crossings used considers a number of factors such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • traffic flows • pedestrians flows • proximity of other features such as schools, stations • junction usage

<p>routes can be provided through the CWM site to the proposed ferry. That will free up money that should be used to deliver the Rotherhithe to Peckham cycleway that is much more urgent given your proposals to substantially increase traffic on roads west of A200.</p>	
<p>Please note our response has also been sent in via email to Transport@southwark.gov.uk I was advised to also submit it via the webform.</p>	<p>Emails have their own tables</p>

Promote local economy	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>This will make it safer for my employees to cycle to work.</p>	
<p>These are very strong proposals which are good for the operation of our business. We would like to see more of this implemented by Southwark Council</p>	

Reduce impact of construction work	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>As a bus user, I am very worried about this scheme - primarily about the slow speeds which will ensue during the roadworks to build this scheme, which will mean that Rotherhithe will be difficult to get to by bus (the only options are 381 or C10 along Redriff Road, or 381 or C10 along Jamaica Road, which is also clogged with cycle friendly</p>	<p>Road works can cause delays to all road users, we will plan these as carefully as possible to minimise there effects, adequate road widths will be maintained for large vehicles</p>

roadworks). The lane narrowing will also make it difficult when two large vehicles such as lorries or buses meet in opposite directions, further slowing progress.

Many residents of this area do not have the ability to cycle, and it is not a perfect solution for everyone - Rotherhithe is a peninsula bounded on 3 sides by water, with poor transport links to the east, north and west - and therefore is much more insular than other areas in Southwark. Therefore, the two bus services that provide a bus service to the peninsula are invaluable as they are the only two affordable means of public transport for the vast majority of people not in walking distance of Rotherhithe, Canada Water and Surrey Quays stations.

I feel that the loss of green space along Redriff Road and Salter Road will also make the community poorer - as this green space will inevitably be replaced with grey tarmac, causing much more visual pollution and detracting from the area. It will also cause higher potential for traffic (both cars and bikes) to hit pedestrians, as these verges provide separation between vehicles and pedestrians.

In my opinion, Southwark Council should do two things - firstly improve the existing cycle tracks through the Russia Dock Woodland by providing

<p>clearer markings, a smoother surface for cyclists, better lighting and improved links to connect to the woodland (at the moment, cyclists have to dismount and cycle up/down a hill to get to the woodland proper). There are many places where the woodland meets Redriff Road and Salter Road - if these connections were improved, many more people would use these cycle paths.</p> <p>Secondly, they should introduce some scheme to slow traffic down that is using the Rotherhithe peninsula - potentially along the lines of an average speed camera system. I agree that cars do routinely use this road at an unsafe speed - however, narrowing the road is not going to stop reckless driving, just endanger local people. Also, they should consider how cars enter Deal Porters Way - at busy times it can be hard to enter the peninsula with two lanes of traffic - with only one it will disproportionately affect local people with traffic caused by users of the shopping centre.</p>	
<p>Strongly support this. It is a quiet and residential area and the more that can be done to encourage safe cycling the better so thank you for developing this plan.</p> <p>I am not sure of the timing but anything to get the cycle paths in place before the masterplan work begins would be fantastic. Once the masterplan starts the area will be full of large construction</p>	<p>Subject to the scheme being approved, some minor works can commence towards the end of February 2020, with the main works starting after the London Marathon</p>

lorries and vehicles and to have a safe segregated space to cycle during that time will make the whole area safer and more pleasant to live and travel in.	
--	--

Reduced on street parking

Comments and or suggestions	Response
-----------------------------	----------

General Support

The plans for segregated cycling and restricted parking are excellent. But there should be segregated cycling the whole way!	
I support some aspects of these proposal [ie restricting parking to prevent the existing grid locks] ... but oppose others such as traffic lights and speed humps.	
You must look at parking along the whole of Rotherhithe Street from the Youth hostel to Salter Road.	
You must also look at the road layout at the tunnel entrance and create a slip road to permit vehicles and buses from Jamaica Road to turn in to Brunel Road and the Rotherhithe Peninsula.	
The bus lane leading to the tunnel mouth from Bermondsey has no purpose if buses get stuck in the grid lock at the tunnel mouth.	

<p>I strongly support the proposals for the Rotherhithe Cycleway. This scheme combined with the Control Parking Zone and Lower Road scheme, are key to unlocking active travel in North East Southwark. We hope these plans represent the start of transforming all of Southwark from car dominated to a place for people, prioritising active travel, be that by foot, bicycle or public transport. This will make our roads safer and our streets better places to live, work and shop as well as helping us deal with the climate crisis the council so wisely declared.</p>	
<p>General Comment</p>	
<p>more parking restrictions</p> <p>wider pavements</p> <p>more speed controls</p> <p>more speed bumps</p> <p>parking restriction nearby the school and nursery</p>	
<p>Parking displacement</p>	
<p>Overall support but Rotherhithe Street parking provision needs to be reviewed or it is simply going to push the problem further down RS and into the surrounding side streets which already seem at capacity</p>	<p>Jo Redshaw</p>
<p>A positive move, but one which will only realise its</p>	

<p>full potential if improvements are made to the Rotherhithe-Canary Wharf link. This initiative needs to be directly linked to that else it will potentially be a white elephant.</p> <p>I do have concerns at the removal of the bus lay-bys on Redriff Road and the effect this will have on the movement of traffic in the proposal generally. In an ideal world i would have no issue but as a cyclist I recognise that frustrated drivers can be dangerous drivers.</p> <p>The double yellows in Rotherhithe Street are a really positive move. Parking on both sides is an issue for bus and lorry traffic especially when wide vans are parked. That said, the plan should include provision for where the displaced cars and vans will park?</p>	
Local parking issue	
<p>The council should be increasing the number of trees instead of reducing them. The loss of mature trees should be compensated with more trees. Strongly support the proposals and welcome the creation of segregated bike lanes. The proposals could be more ambitious by reducing (or eliminating) all parking in Redriff / Alfred salter.</p>	

River crossings	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Comments related to river crossing to Canary Wharf	
<p>Cycle lane in redriff salter road is meaningless till the Rotherhithe Canary Wharf crossing is created. No bridge implies waste of public money to create cycle lanes that cannot be used to cross into Canary Wharf</p>	
<p>Fantastic!</p> <p>-However, please note that the bridge going into Stave Hill park at the south east end from NCR 4/quietway 14 is broken so its hard to cycle this route at the moment.</p> <p>-Also it is frustrating that you cant walk all the way along the river front and developments like Odessa Wharf has an access along the front but the bridge is broken and new imperial wharf has privatised their river frontage, (which i feel is not in keeping with the spirit of the area) not to mention the hilton hotel!!</p> <p>- Also I hope this doesn't detract from the effort o increase pedestrian and cycle connectivity across the river, i am still very disappointed that the bridge has been put on hold for the long</p>	

term and I feel like we should really push for some kind of free access for people and bicycles over the river, and soon!

The cycle highway is good in general but I think you've overlooked the routes that pedestrians use and how cars drive along some of these routes. It could be made safer.

Can you please consider bringing back the proposed bridge that was scrapped? My work is directly opposite this area on the river but to get there by bike, I'd have to cycle all the way into zone 1 and back out again, through all the pollution and more risk of accident.

With regards to the controlled parking:

The docklands is a lovely residential area and there any never any issues with on street parking. A controlled parking zone is ridiculous.

There are never any issues parking on our street and I can't believe you are turning such a lovely, residential area of London into a controlled parking zone that will completely ruin the streets. Why can't you make all of the new builds provide parking in the building rather than the council paying to implement controlled parking everywhere. It's a waste of council money when the private builders can provide parking within the development.

The docklands is a lovely peaceful area with no issues around parking. I lived in an area with controlled parking previously and it was a nightmare, especially when trying to get visitor permits and I could only obtain them from the council office in The Blue which was only open when I was at work and was nowhere near my home or workplace.

Please do not enforce restrictions in an area area that doesn't need it. The docklands are nowhere near the new Canada Water plan. Is it 100% certain that the Canada Water Plan will go ahead anyway? You've already scrapped the much need bridge proposal that was needed so badly!

Have you walked around the docklands to see how easy it is to park and how little cars there are? It feels like a money making scheme to me.

Generally, this seems a pointless exercise whereby the council is just looking to spend money and keep people in jobs. Such excessive works are not necessary and much lighter touch works could be introduced. **Equally, with the bridge project being cancelled it seems a worthless project.**

Lower road is a major traffic through-route south of the river, with no reasonable alternative. This route already gets congested and this congestion is slowly getting worse. The priority of any road changes should surely be to reduce the road

congestion. The volume of motor vehicles, I expect, would outnumber bicycles by at least 1,000-to-1. The priority should be the majority, not a few people who happen to be today's political fad.

The cycle route along Redriff Road looks like no more than someone's personal pet project born out of a stupid idea. The benefits do not appear, to me, to justify the cost of implementation, the disruption to the area, and the worsening of an already congested part of London.

What plans are there to undo all of the changes, and what funds are being held back to do this, should the whole thing turn out to be a congestion disaster? Whose idea is the whole thing and will they resign if the expected congestion disaster unfolds?

When is the long-proposed footbridge from Rotherhithe to the Isle of Dogs materialising? Have Thames Clippers successfully lobbied against it?

Money would far better be spent by extending the Jubilee Line from Canada Water along to Greenwich to connect to the DLR and on to the O2, with 2-3 stations in-between. The area from Surrey Quays to Greenwich, once a commercial area and now mostly a modern residential area, has zero

<p>public transport other than busses, from Surrey Quays all the way to Greenwich. This is a planning cock-up of the highest order.</p>	
<p>The cycle route is in the wrong place. Traffic lights will slow up traffic which already backs-up enough.</p> <p>Apart for a few zebra crossings and some double yellow lines this is little to benefit those who live here. It is all about those coming into the area.</p> <p>It is as if the whole project is for cyclists. Is it?</p> <p>Put the money into something really useful like the bridge.</p> <p>Improve transport links on the buses and tubes, before you increase the population with the Canada Water development. Local residents were promised that there would be no problems, because all would be sorted out by cross-rail and the new bridge.</p> <p>Were we lied too?</p>	
<p>Majority of changes seem to be proposed to support cyclist on the route to the Rotherhithe cycle and pedestrian Bridge.</p> <p>As this Bridge project has now been cancelled there is no need for the proposed changes.</p>	

<p>Width restrictions to accommodate cyclists (that will not be there) will cause congestion along the whole length of Redriff Road and will back up all the way to Salter Road.</p>	
<p>A positive move, but one which will only realise its full potential if improvements are made to the Rotherhithe-Canary Wharf link. This initiative needs to be directly linked to that else it will potentially be a white elephant.</p> <p>I do have concerns at the removal of the bus lay-bys on Redriff Road and the effect this will have on the movement of traffic in the proposal generally. In an ideal world i would have no issue but as a cyclist I recognise that frustrated drivers can be dangerous drivers.</p> <p>The double yellows in Rotherhithe Street are a really positive move. Parking on both sides is an issue for bus and lorry traffic especially when wide vans are parked. That said, the plan should include provision for where the displaced cars and vans will park?</p>	
<p>Strongly oppose to the Redriff road section, to much of a safety aspect and also the cost can't be justified when the cyclist can go along Greenland dock, which would be safer option. But agree with Rotherhithe Street, but more safety needs to be</p>	

addressed with all road users.

As the bridge plan to Canary Wharf has been turned down I can't see the justification at the moment to spend the money and wait for the new development in Canada Water Then work with them to help towards the funding of the cycle lane and towards the bridge to Canary Wharf!

This is another cycle path to nowhere. The proposed pedestrian and cycle bridge is not being built, there is already a cycle route through the park. Money squandered.

I strongly oppose because you have failed to provide the Surrey Quays to Peckham cycleway west of A200 and that must be a priority now the bridge is not being built. It should all be delivered at the same time. I think it is terrible to remove zebra crossings on some roads to help traffic dominate while providing new zebra crossing on other roads nearby. It is double standards and deeply unfair. It is always about the peninsula and not about west of A200. And I am fed up with that.

I regularly commute by bike from Streatham to canary wharf. There is currently no route that is particularly safe or pleasant - I would be really keen to use this route via ferry if it were implemented.

<p>My only other comment is that it would be great to see more routes that make it more feasible to cycle or walk for local journeys (as well as commuting) as this would help reduce the number of short distance car journeys.</p>	
<p>The main reason for having a Rotherhithe cycleway was to provide for the extra cycles because a cycle bridge over the Thames was planned. I think the Rotherhithe cycleway should not be proceeded with until the need for it can be proven once the free ferry has commenced because the expense would not be justified. Currently there are already designated cycle routes in the area.</p>	

Road maintenance	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Fantastic!</p> <p>-However, please note that the bridge going into Stave Hill park at the south east end from NCR 4/quietway 14 is broken so its hard to cycle this route at the moment.</p> <p>-Also it is frustrating that you cant walk all the way along the river front and developments like Odessa Wharf has an access along the front but the bridge is broken and new imperial wharf has privatised</p>	<p>Donavan</p>

<p>their river frontage, (which i feel is not in keeping with the spirit of the area) not to mention the hilton hotel!!</p> <p>- Also I hope this doesn't detract from the effort o increase pedestrian and cycle connectivity across the river, i am still very disappointed that the bridge has been put on hold for the long term and I feel like we should really push for some kind of free access for people and bicycles over the river, and soon!</p>	
<p>with the use of tiger crossings, signage should be used to notify motorists that they have to give way. most motorists are unaware of these crossings, which can create fatal accidents.</p> <p>SUDS should be considered on new pavements to green the area and help prevent flooding</p>	<p>Opportunities for implementing SUDS will be explored at the detail design stage</p>

Safer speeds	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
Speeds on Salter Road \ Brunel Road	
<p>Great to see the Council promoting safer cycling routes. Would like to see them go even further to reduce speeding on Salter Road. Segregated cycle ways are essential to give more people the confidence to get on their bikes. Why no proposals to improve cycling facilities on the North side of the</p>	<p>Southwark is aware of the high speeds at these locations and it is on our priority list to produce a solution.</p> <p>The future of the speed camera is being discussed with TfL and the Police</p>

<p>peninsula on Salter Road?</p>	
<p>The separate dual cycle way is not necessary. I cycle both Salter road and Rotherhithe street every day and can tell from experience it is not needed. What we need it to slow down the traffic on both these roads, and facilitate traffic with more double yellow lines on Rotherhithe street, so that the c10 bus can easily circulate.</p>	
<p>While I strongly support these proposals, it is very disappointing the segregated cycleway doesn't extend all the way around the peninsula. Speeding is a major problem on Brunel Road/Salter Road around Rotherhithe Station - what is being done to address that?</p>	
<p>There need to be more speed restrictions on Redriff/Salter Road. More speed cameras.</p> <p>I don't agree with the yellow lines. Let cars park there - it will slow down the traffic</p> <p>Please don't remove that speed camera. It has saved lives!</p>	
<p>As a bus user, I am very worried about this scheme - primarily about the slow speeds which will ensue during the roadworks to build this scheme, which will mean that Rotherhithe will be difficult to get to by bus (the only options are 381 or C10 along Redriff Road, or 381 or C10 along Jamaica Road, which is also clogged with cycle</p>	

friendly roadworks). The lane narrowing will also make it difficult when two large vehicles such as lorries or buses meet in opposite directions, further slowing progress.

Many residents of this area do not have the ability to cycle, and it is not a perfect solution for everyone - Rotherhithe is a peninsula bounded on 3 sides by water, with poor transport links to the east, north and west - and therefore is much more insular than other areas in Southwark. Therefore, the two bus services that provide a bus service to the peninsula are invaluable as they are the only two affordable means of public transport for the vast majority of people not in walking distance of Rotherhithe, Canada Water and Surrey Quays stations.

I feel that the loss of green space along Redriff Road and Salter Road will also make the community poorer - as this green space will inevitably be replaced with grey tarmac, causing much more visual pollution and detracting from the area. It will also cause higher potential for traffic (both cars and bikes) to hit pedestrians, as these verges provide separation between vehicles and pedestrians.

In my opinion, Southwark Council should do two things - firstly improve the existing cycle tracks

through the Russia Dock Woodland by providing clearer markings, a smoother surface for cyclists, better lighting and improved links to connect to the woodland (at the moment, cyclists have to dismount and cycle up/down a hill to get to the woodland proper). There are many places where the woodland meets Redriff Road and Salter Road - if these connections were improved, many more people would use these cycle paths.

Secondly, they should introduce some scheme to slow traffic down that is using the Rotherhithe peninsula - potentially along the lines of an average speed camera system. I agree that cars do routinely use this road at an unsafe speed - however, narrowing the road is not going to stop reckless driving, just endanger local people. Also, they should consider how cars enter Deal Porters Way - at busy times it can be hard to enter the peninsula with two lanes of traffic - with only one it will disproportionately affect local people with traffic caused by users of the shopping centre.

I'd like to see speed humps down Quebec Way too as people often speed down the road - particularly teens on scooters pulling wheelies!

Starts off pretty good nearer Lower Road. Good level of protection/segregation. Great stuff. Minor junctions need a bit of work to better protect people on bikes from being hit by turning vehicles (i.e. turning radii are left too wide so left turning

<p>drivers don't have a clear view of cyclist approaching from 'behind' them). The junction with Rotherhithe Street is a mess. Far too complex/cumbersome, and turning radius for motor vehicles is far too wide - encouraging high speed. On Rotherhithe Street itself people on bikes are just dumped in the highway to fend for themselves. Segregation disappears. Really poor show. If you're asking people on bikes to share the highway with motor vehicles you need to make sure there is sufficient filtered permeability to keep traffic speeds and volumes very low. This scheme fails to do that on Rotherhithe Street.</p>	
<p>Increase speed limit</p>	
<p>Redriff Road to Rotherhithe Street needs more trees in addition to those lost to the scheme. The new zebra in this section is not on an obvious desire line and should be closer to Omega Gate allowing safe access for pedestrians to the woodlands. The speed limit on the peninsula should be put back to 30mph. The drop to 20mph saw a marked increase in speeding and overtaking because it is too slow for such a large, long road. The introduction of zebras and in lane bus stops will curb the excess speed and limit overtaking but drivers need to be free to make progress at a reasonable rate otherwise.</p>	<p>The borough has a speed limit of 20 mph, overall this has been successful, there are location where we need to do further works, such as Salter Road \ Redriff Road, drivers exceeding the speed limit is not a reason to increase it.</p> <p>The proposal aim to address the speeding problem on this road</p>
<p>General comments</p>	

<p>These changes should help decrease traffic speeds, without hopefully adversely affecting the buses, and encourage cyclists and walkers, and reduce noise and improve air quality with a bit of luck!</p>	
<p>more parking restrictions</p> <p>wider pavements</p> <p>more speed controls</p> <p>more speed bumps</p> <p>parking restriction nearby the school and nursery</p>	
<p>Just need to make sure that all steps are taken with these changes to encourage compliance with the 20mph speed limit. Greater use of interventions from the TfL Lower Speeds Toolkit would be welcome.</p>	
<p>Request for further speed reduction</p>	
<p>I'd like to see speed humps down Quebec Way too as people often speed down the road - particularly teens on scooters pulling wheelies!</p>	
<p>Starts off pretty good nearer Lower Road. Good level of protection/segregation. Great stuff. Minor junctions need a bit of work to better protect people on bikes from being hit by turning vehicles (i.e. turning radii are left too wide so left turning drivers</p>	

<p>don't have a clear view of cyclist approaching from 'behind' them). The junction with Rotherhithe Street is a mess. Far too complex/cumbersome, and turning radius for motor vehicles is far too wide - encouraging high speed. On Rotherhithe Street itself people on bikes are just dumped in the highway to fend for themselves. Segregation disappears. Really poor show. If you're asking people on bikes to share the highway with motor vehicles you need to make sure there is sufficient filtered permeability to keep traffic speeds and volumes very low. This scheme fails to do that on Rotherhithe Street.</p>	
<p>We need more speed bumps to stop speeding and definitely more cycling paths.</p>	

Segregation between cyclist and pedestrians	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>I strongly support the proposals, despite some minor issues. The main issues are:</p> <p>I would like to see early release green lights for cycles at every signalised junction.</p> <p>The "camden kerb" on the bridge next to Omega Gate does not provide sufficient visual distinction between the cycling surface and walking surface. The level of the cycle track</p>	<p>The Camden kerb is being used around structures where the design has effected our ability to provide a full segregation. Improved footway will reinforce the difference between the footway and the cycleway and encourage both pedestrians and cyclist to use there area. There will be a change in footway material will provide clear visual distinction from cycleway</p>

<p>should be lower than the footpath.</p> <p>Rotherhithe Street is not sufficiently traffic-calmed modal filters should along Rotherhithe Street so that resident access is maintained while preventing through traffic for all modes other than buses and cycles.</p> <p>"Sinusoidal" speed humps would be preferable on Rotherhithe Street, even if they incorporate a flat top. The humps should not be made of paving stones or any other material which becomes difficult to ride over with age and wear. Perhaps they should be made of asphalt, so that the surface is more elastic and easy to repair.</p>	
---	--

Wider and well-maintained pavements/walking routes	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>more parking restrictions</p> <p>wider pavements</p> <p>more speed controls</p> <p>more speed bumps</p> <p>parking restriction nearby the school and nursery</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>In principal I support making streets better for</p>	<p>Where appropriate footways will be improved</p>

<p>cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>This should be integrated with Suds, good quality planting, more green..it is good for our mental health.</p> <p>Also handy cycle racks near shops..not some inconvenient place all together up the road!</p> <p>Level crossings for pedestrians are a bit of a pain for cyclists..although suppose pedestrians should be the priority.</p> <p>Trees and planting help give the message to drive carefully, better than signs and bumps.</p> <p>Good quality paving always makes your walk more pleasant.</p>	
--	--

Email Replies

Improve air quality	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>With respect to the movement plan and in response to the changes in the Rotherhithe area:</p> <p>In my opinion, I think it is very important to address the issue of air pollution with the view to enable people to lead more active lives, by providing better cycling and walking environments while maintaining</p>	

<p>and improving your current quality of life.</p> <p>The streets around Southwark need to be planned a lot better. For example you could reach out to a company like Woodland Trust to request that they assess the roads and also the permeability. Tree lined streets create safer looking environments, assist with the issue of air pollution and can curb violence on the streets. They also create more scenic and attractive environments.</p>	
--	--

Crossing roads is easy and safe	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Hi,</p> <p>I tried accessing the questionnaire online, but the website kept crashing. Could you please include a zebra crossing on salter Road (where onega gate bus stop is)? It is the main access from Finland Street / Onega Gate to Russia Dock woodlands and loads of school children have to cross the busy road every day.</p> <p>I have put a similar request in a couple of years ago.</p>	

Cyclist behaviour & keep off pavements	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Many cyclists behave in an aggressive, heedless</p>	

<p>and selfish manner, with no thought for pedestrians who may be partly deaf, have difficulties in walking, or may be children. My grandchild was very nearly hit yesterday by a cyclist quite legitimately on the pavement which is the official cycle route. It is safer to walk on the road but it's hard to explain that to a 5 year old. Thought and money should be put into proper control and education of cyclists, not just handing over yet more space to them mixed up with pedestrians. As to movement of buses that could be sorted by parking control of Rotherhithe Street alone. and does not need to make the entire peninsula difficult for residents and their visitors.</p>	
<p>I walk a lot-cyclists are often too fast and too close. Cycle lanes in pedestrian areas only give cyclists a feeling of entitlement.</p> <p>I have had many near misses due to cyclists speed and carelessness</p>	

Do not agree with traffic calming/reduction and cycle lanes	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>please don't waste my taxes on a cycle way along Redriff Road. What problem are you trying to solve?? it's already a wide road with plenty of room for all road users. Absolutely no need to make a special route for bikes. Don't waste my taxes on this bonkers scheme.</p>	

Easy and safe to cycle

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>Hello,</p> <p>Quick feedback on the plans which I looked at online. I could not find the questionnaire to complete.</p> <p>My views in brief:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- I am in favour of new cycle ways. The more the better, especially segregated ones- Walking routes are great too.- Private cars come last in my view, for a sustainable future and a livable city. It's too easy and cheap for people to choose to drive rather than other options. I say this as a car owner!	

More and safer cycle infrastructure/ routes

Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>However, running the Rotherhithe cycleway along Rotherhithe Street seems to me a rather bad idea. I don't cycle there but I bump along on the C10 from time to time. There may not be much traffic but the street is narrow, with on-street parking, and it's often congested.</p>	
<p>It's quite a manoeuvre when two C10s meet. I think a cycleway wouldn't make cycling more pleasant</p>	

<p>and would only add to the congestion.</p> <p>I suggest a better idea would be to continue the cycleway right round Salter Road. Rotherhithe Street can then be accessed at various points.</p>	
<p>I have received the proposal to improve walking and cycling in the Rotherhithe area.</p> <p>I have my concerns about a cycleway on Redriff Road and particularly on Rotherhithe Street. It is already difficult to let one car pass through Rotherhithe Street when the cars are parked on both side and the C10 bus passes through.</p> <p>I really cannot see how we can implement a cycleway there.</p>	

Other	
Comments and or suggestions	Response
<p>With respect to the movement plan and in response to the changes in the Rotherhithe area:</p> <p>In my opinion, I think it is very important to address the issue of air pollution with the view to enable people to lead more active lives, by providing better cycling and walking environments while maintaining and improving your current quality of life.</p> <p>The streets around Southwark need to be planned a lot better. For example you could reach out to a company like Woodland Trust to request that they assess the roads and also the permeability. Tree lined streets create safer looking environments,</p>	

assist with the issue of air pollution and can curb violence on the streets. They also create more scenic and attractive environments.	
--	--

