

## Response ID ANON-P93D-7CE6-N

Submitted to **Have your say on Cycle Superhighway Route 4 from Tower Bridge to Greenwich**  
Submitted on **2017-11-18 10:03:19**

### Our overall proposals

#### 1 Do you support the overall proposals?

Strongly support

#### 2 Do you have any comments on the overall proposals?

##### Comments on the overall proposals :

Living Streets and London Living Streets are overall strongly supportive of the proposed development of CS4. We support proposals to introduce segregated cycle tracks, to improve pedestrian crossings, the new and improved public spaces at Deptford High Street and the Rotherhithe Roundabout including new paving and trees as well as new traffic restrictions including banned turns along Jamaica Road and Deptford High Street.

We are at the same time sympathetic to the concerns of Southwark Council and local residents about the potential impact of the scheme in terms of the migration of vehicular traffic to surrounding roads. We feel that, as with many schemes in Inner London, changes of these sort that affect the balance between motor vehicles and people are made more difficult by the lack of a holistic approach to motor vehicle movements in these more congested parts of London. We understand that Southwark Council has proposed the tolling of the Rotherhithe Tunnel to reduce the impact of traffic in the area and thus free carriageway capacity for this scheme to be introduced with fewer negative impacts in the surrounding area. We would go further than this and again suggest either that road pricing is introduced that covers this area or that the Congestion Charge Zone is extended to cover the area covered by this scheme. Only until this occurs and motor traffic volumes are reduced can the Healthy Streets agenda be properly taken forward in London in a way that does not produce potential dis-benefits from these pro-active travel schemes.

We have a number of concerns that relate to the delivery of the whole CS4 scheme and would request that these are considered. We would recommend a 20mph default throughout the scheme and use of the TfL 20mph Toolkit to ensure high levels of compliance with this limit.

We recommend throughout the use of continuous footway/Copenhagen style crossing when less major side roads meet the scheme.

While we understand the need for floating bus stops/bus stop bypasses, it essential that they are designed to a high quality and follow TfL best practice and that they learn the lessons of TfL's recent investigations into them. Key is not narrowing the adjacent footway space to a level that means that pedestrians are stepping into the cycle lane. The preference is always to remove carriageway space rather than building by-passes into footway space. We would note the improved recent designs that we have seen around London whereby the more recent ones developed on CS6 along Blackfriars Road appear far more pedestrian friendly than earlier versions on Whitechapel Rd.

We feel strongly that mini-roundabouts have no place in this scheme and should be removed/redesigned. Mini-roundabouts serve to prioritise vehicular movement and speed it up. They create intimidation for people on foot by marginalising them and importantly they force pedestrians off the desire line as well as offering poor quality crossings for them – this is very much in evidence on Evelyn St at the Oxstalls Road and Abinger Grove. These should be redesigned as signalised junctions.

We support the decluttering of footways with guardrail removal and the creation of new public realm for example at New King St.

### Our proposals by section

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

Support

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

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

Support

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

We welcome the introduction of the new pedestrian crossings at surface level but have concerns about their complexity. By maintaining four lanes of traffic and the removal of the media strip and the introduction of the segregated cycle lane, informal crossing is inevitably now much more difficult. It is therefore important that the formal crossings are single stage to reduce complexity and to reduce crossing times and distances. We recommend that where possible centre white lines are removed. In places the proposed arrangement of bus lanes and carriageway will be similar to that on Kennington Park Road where the centre white line removal has been used successfully to reduce vehicle speeds. Overall owing to the numbers of pedestrians in the area a 20mph limit should be introduced throughout this area.

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

Strongly support

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

We particularly welcome that creation of the simplified and extra-wide crossing at Bermondsey tube station. We trust that waiting times will be kept to reasonable levels. We would like to see the crossings on West Lane to be reconsidered. Despite being opposite the supermarket and a busy pedestrian area, there is no formal crossing on the western arm – this should be reconsidered and one should be introduced. On the east side of that junction, there are real concerns about the degree of the stagger on the crossing and the way that it departs so dramatically from the pedestrian desire line. This should be redesigned to fit with the pedestrian desire lines.

**6 Do you support the proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout?**

Neither support nor oppose

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

We feel that this is a hostile environment for pedestrian and like the Bricklayer Arms Roundabout serves to sever the peninsula from the remainder of the borough. A long-term plan is needed to remove the roundabout and to help reduce the severance the current road layout causes. We propose that in the longer term, with road pricing introduced and vehicle volumes reduced, the roundabout and the enormous space that it requires could be replaced with a signalised junction.

We support the introduction of 20mph limits in this area.

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

Strongly oppose

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

We support the wider footway along by Deptford Park school and the removal of centre line marking which we would like to see occur more often in this scheme but we strongly oppose the new mini-roundabout on Oxstalls Road replacing a signalised crossing. Mini-roundabout inevitably speed-up traffic and confirm vehicle dominance of a space. In addition, pedestrians are often thrown way off their desire line and this has clearly occurred on the northern side of this junction. We strongly recommend that this design is not taken forward and this mini-roundabout is removed from the scheme.

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

Oppose

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

We do not see significant improvements in this part of the scheme in conditions for pedestrians. On the contrary, the redesign of the mini-roundabout at Abinger Grove appears to offer no safe crossings for pedestrians on any of the arms except for the northern one where again the pedestrian's route is pushed off the desire line.

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

Strongly support

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

Support the improved alignment of the roads to the north and the introduction of the pedestrian crossing on the desire line.

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

Neither support nor oppose

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

Concerns over the design of the staggered crossings at the junction with Deptford Church St. This remains a hostile environment for pedestrians with so many lanes to cross

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

Support

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

Appreciate use of straight ahead crossings and the removal of a traffic lane on Glaisher St.

**About you**

**12 What is your name?**

**Name:**

Jeremy Leach

**13 What is your email address?**

**Email:**

jeremyleach@posteo.net

**14 Please provide us with your postcode.**

**Postcode:**

SE17 3EQ

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

Other (please specify)

**Other:**

Community group representative

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

Bus, Cycle, Walk/Wheelchair

**Other:**

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

**Organisation:**

Living Streets and London Living Streets

**18 How did you find out about this consultation?**

Received an email from TfL

**Other:**

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

Very good

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

**Equality Monitoring**

**20 Gender:**

Male

**21 Ethnic Group:**

White – British

**22 Age:**

56-60

**23 Sexual Orientation:**

Not Answered

**24 Religious faith:**

Not Answered

**25 Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months? (Please include problems related to old age)**

No

**26 If you answered yes to the above question, please tell us which category below best describes your disability or health problem. Please tick all that apply.**

**Other:**