

# Response ID ANON-26UW-RQMW-U

Submitted to **Have your say on Cycle Superhighway 9 from Kensington Olympia to Brentford town centre**  
Submitted on **2017-10-31 10:56:15**

## Our overall proposals

### 1 Do you support our overall proposals?

Strongly support

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

#### Comments:

While London Living Streets is overall strongly supportive of the proposed development of CS9 we have a number of concerns that relate principally to the impact of the proposals on the quality of the pedestrian environment and the fact that, in spite of a draft MTS hierarchy that prioritises pedestrian, cycling and public transport movement over private vehicular traffic the proposals tend to default to the removal of pedestrian rather than carriageway capacity and create a significant amount of space that is shared between people who are cycling and those who are walking. The presumption should be far more readily to remove carriageway capacity without that being to the detriment of public transport. We have concerns over the widespread removal of zebra crossings and their replacement with signalised crossings. Where this occurs, wait times should be absolutely minimised and crossing times set to accommodate people who require more time to cross. There should absolutely not be a default to waiting times that invariably require pedestrians to wait for a full or almost full cycle of vehicular movement as often occurs in London. General concern that footway space is being lost and it is important that pedestrian comfort levels remain to a good standard especially in busy high street location and that footways are decluttered to maximise the space available. 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. We do not support the use of shared footway elements of the scheme. These indicate a failure of design. Concern that to the west of King St the default appears to be removal of footway space and little or no impact from the scheme on carriageway capacity. This appears contrary to all of the tenets of the Mayor's Transport Strategy which places pedestrians at the top of the hierarchy and private motor vehicles at the bottom. While we are overall supportive of promoting cycling through the CS it is not appropriate to remove space from inactive forms of travels such as the motor vehicle. We support of course the retention and prioritisation of bus movements and improved journey times.

## Our proposals by section

### 3 Do you support the proposals for Hammersmith Road?

Support

#### Do you have any comments on the proposals for Hammersmith Road:

Strongly support the narrowing of the Shortlands and Rowan Road junctions with Hammersmith Road and associated crossings. Support bus lane hours extension. Suggest that all minor sideroads should be continuous footway/Copenhagen style crossings in order to reduce the danger to pedestrians. The design of any floating bus stops should ensure that pedestrian safety is maximised. Overall we are pleased that footway space is not being removed and that most of the space required is being taken from the carriageway. We suggest further measures to increase compliance with the 20mph limit as outlined in the TfL 20mph Toolkit. We absolutely descry the loss of segregated cycle lanes at the border with RBKC and the reverting to two-stage crossings (eg at Holland Road). We are extremely concerned that the 20mph limits end at exactly the point at which people who are cycling are no longer afforded protection with segregated lanes.

### 4 Do you support the proposals for Hammersmith Gyratory?

Support

#### Do you have any comments on the proposals for Hammersmith Gyratory? :

From a pedestrian point of view the retention of this gyratory layout will ensure that the environment in this town centre location (linked to a transport interchange) will remain a hostile environment and one that is at odds with the Healthy Streets agenda.

### 5 Do you support the proposals for Beadon Road?

Support

#### Do you have any comments on the proposals for Beadon Road? :

Support the tightening of the junction with Hammersmith Grove and the associated signalised crossings.

### 6 Do you support the proposals for King Street (East)?

Support

#### Do you have any comments on the proposals for King Street (East):

Concerns over the loss of footway space on northern side in a location where there are high levels of pedestrian movement. It is important that pedestrian comfort levels remain high on a busy high street location such as this. Measures may be required to reduce street clutter to maximise the available footway space that remains. Section E – support the new entry treatments with cycle priority across the various side roads which give significant benefits to pedestrians. Junction with Studland St and the crossing between Studland St and Dalling Road. Do not support the use of a shared space to enable people who are cycling to access Studland St – this should be designed to ensure that shared space is not required. Outside H&F offices, the southern footway is being narrowed and we do not

support such a degree of narrowing.

**7 Do you support the proposals for King Street (West)?**

Support

**Do you have any comments on the proposals for King Street (West)? :**

**8 Do you support the proposals for Chiswick High Road?**

Support

**Do you have any comments on the proposals for Chiswick High Road?:**

We have concerns about the loss of footway on this busy pedestrian location and comfort levels need to be retained. Concerns about the junction with Chiswick Lane and the conversion of footway into shared use. We are against where there is significant loss of footway space such as between Duke Road and Duke's Avenue. This goes back to the prioritisation of vehicular movement that we have noted and we feel that the provision of a left turn lane is not necessary here and that this should not be prioritised over the loss of footway capacity. Concerned about the removal of a number of zebra crossings in this section; any new signalised crossings should minimise wait times and maximise crossings times for pedestrians. Junction with Goldhawk Road and British Grove – would like to see further narrowing of the Chiswick High Road at the junction where it is currently two lanes in both directions adding to both pedestrian crossing times and distances. Junction with Heathfield Terrace, we support the tightening of the junction and the creation of a single stage pedestrian crossing.

**9 Do you support the proposals for Heathfield Terrace / Wellesley Road?**

Support

**Do you have any comments on the proposals for Heathfield Terrace / Wellesley Road? :**

Support the removal of the mini-roundabout at Brooks Road and its replacement with a give-way junction. Also support the new raised entry treatments.

**10 Do you support the proposals for South Circular Road (Kew Bridge Station)?**

Oppose

**Do you have any comments on the proposals for South Circular Road (Kew Bridge Station)? :**

This remains a car dominated environment with pedestrians having to cross each road in several stages.

**11 Do you support the proposals for Kew Bridge Road / Watermans Park / Brentford High Street (East)?**

Support

**Do you have any comments on the proposals for Kew Bridge Road / Watermans Park / Brentford High Street (East)? :**

Support entry treatments but do not support the complete loss of footway space by bus stops adjacent to Heritage Walk southern footway.

**12 Do you support the proposals for Brentford High Street (West)?**

Not Answered

**Do you have any comments on the proposals for Brentford High Street (West)? :**

**13 Do you have any comments on future proposals for CS9 from Brentford High Street to Hounslow town centre?**

**Comments:**

**About you**

**14 What is your name?**

**Name:**

Jeremy Leach

**15 What is your email address?**

**Email:**

jeremyleach@posteo.net

**16 Please provide us with your postcode?**

**Postcode:**

SE17 3EQ

**17 Are you (please tick all boxes that apply):**

Not local but interested in the scheme

**Other:**

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

Tube

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

**Organisation:**

London Living Streets

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

Received an email from TfL

**Other:**

**21 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?:**

Would be good to make clearer/highlight the proportion of footway space that is being gain and lost overall. Good too to have more information on vehicle speeds on these roads and potentially project the impact of the scheme on vehicle speeds. Both H&F and Hounslow are 20mph boroughs to a greater or lesser degree and it is important that TfL schemes support their aims to ensure compliance with those limits.

## **Equality Monitoring**

**22 Gender:**

Male

**23 Ethnic Group:**

White – British

**24 Age:**

56-60

**25 Sexual Orientation:**

Not Answered

**26 Faith:**

Not Answered

**27 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

**28 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:**