

Lewisham Cyclists response to Crofton Park Streetscape Improvements Consultation September 2017

Headline response:

Investment to improve Crofton Park area welcome and better linkages needed over the busy roads in the area to enable a strong cycling network in Lewisham. However, the proposals have several shortcomings that concern us and present a problem in the current design:

Changes that are not numbered in the consultation but are significant and should be noted:

1. Road space allocation

- a. The road along the corridor is typically is being narrowed to a 6.4m width but combined with parking bays that are 2m or less in width. Reality is that people cycling along the route will have to take primary position (centre of remaining lane) for safety from car doors etc (no buffer strip provided on parking makes this vital for their safety). This will not be possible where route suffers from congestion and will not encourage people from all walks of life to cycle along the scheme.
- b. Over the long term if the current cycle vision and healthy streets are to be followed it is logical that cycling for a wider range of people must be catered for on Brockley Road. Hence, consideration must be given to providing space for cycling as opposed to parking. The clearly stated mayoral aim is for people to be using active travel to reach high streets, not their cars. Consultation details say there is an increase in parking spaces provided. High profile and successful schemes in Mini Holland boroughs such as Enfield and Waltham Forest have worked to remove parking provision on main roads and provide cycle tracks.
- c. The short cycle track in this scheme to enable crossing the road is compromised and presents a minor improvement over the existing crossing for the same route. It does not provide a safe linkage from the quiet route into Lewisham via the railway bridge

1. Road geometry

- a. Junctions should be tightened up (more like a 1m radii not 2m as appears on consultation drawings), especially for Eddystone Road and Sevenoaks Road where cycles are expected to turn right at the junction mouth to enter a section of pavement with cycle track or permission to cycle.

1. Guardrail removal

- a. All existing guardrail also serves some of the time as cycle parking with a very high capacity if not ideal street furniture to lock to.
 - b. The provision of new cycle parking should have been highlighted as a point for feedback. It would have been wise to see where people would most like to see cycle parking. Only car parking has been highlighted in the consultation materials.
 - c. Some car parking bays could convert to cycle parking depending on demand.
 - d. The railway station at Crofton Park should be the focus of some high capacity cycle parking as it links to areas that the majority of stations nearby do not. There are currently 20 sheltered spaces under canopy on platform 1

1. 20mph roundels on side roads

- a. If the corridor is being redesigned to reflect 20mph, why are 20mph roundels being retained on side roads?

1. Yellow lines

- a. A lot of expensive paving is being used to give a different sense to the space and yet yellow lines are then to be painted over it to provide parking restriction. Why not use a restricted parking zone?

1. Continuous pavements or Copenhagen Crossings
- a. Other proposals in Lewisham have included Copenhagen crossings with a continuous pavement provided over the mouth of side roads. This does help calm traffic entering side roads by visually reinforcing priority given in level with tables at entries. This scheme is expensive and should be able to deliver such design, as seen in other such schemes in London and the mini-holland projects.

Changes that are numbered by Project Centre:

1. New Trees
 1. Trees are always welcome, but it should be born in mind that over their lifetime need may become clear to reallocate road space and create a cycle track along this road.
2. Widened footway with relocated bus stop and shelter
3. Two way segregated lane on footway
 1. This is narrow for a two way facility at 3m and marking it with lanes is not a sensible idea.
4. New inset parking bays
 1. What steps will be taken to control usage of these bays?
 2. Bays are only 2m wide, no buffer strip is provided.
5. New Toucan crossing to replace the one near Bartram Road
 1. Shops at the corner of Eddystone road repeatedly use space on the pavement for display of goods (window frames). This must be considered and handled to ensure success of crossing.
 2. Alternately a fully separated junction could be built by combining the filtering of Eddystone road with the removal of the roundabout and the introduction of a simplified signalled crossing with direct cycle movements. This would also permit a movement for cycles from Eddystone road into Brockley Grove that uses signal timing to give a head start for cycle traffic to avoid conflict from other traffic.
6. Segregated cycle lane on widened footway
 1. Only one way meaning people are expected to cycle over the roundabout to reach Brockley Grove. Why not tolerate two way use? Will it happen anyway?
7. Raised junction to reduce vehicle speed
 1. Materials for the raised junction must be strong and checked carefully after installation. Several raised tables and junctions on Quietway 1 are now loose, and the raised areas on Peckham Rye have had to be removed and replaced with tarmac. Any expensive paving solution that is core to the traffic calming design of the scheme must be planned and installed in such a fashion as to last the life of the design.
8. Mini-roundabout retained
 1. The decision to retain a roundabout is a concern, the existing roundabout has regular near misses for people cycling trying to navigate fast traffic.
 2. The routing from Eddystone Road to Brockley Grove in the new scheme still depends on using the roundabout which is offputting to many who would or could cycle this route. In contrast the routing from Brockley Grove to Eddystone Road can use the short cycle track and a toucan crossing. A safe route for all ages should be delivered. It is possible to deliver some routing via Hazeldon Rd toward Brockley Grove over the new public space at the corner of Brockley Grove.
 3. Why is the roundabout retained? Why not go for a more compact junction and perhaps use signalisation and cycle tracks in another form. A simplified T-junction could be used somewhat like that for Portland Street at the junction on Burgess Park in the Q7 quietway scheme.
 4. The separating island that is retained for the mini-roundabout could be removed to permit more space for a separated cycle junction at this junction.
 5. Eddystone road could be closed as a trial as part of the works, and will likely have to be closed during construction anyway. At minimum a closure of Eddystone road would support the toucan connect better.
9. Widened footway with cycle racks

1. Extra cycle racks welcome but note all dedicated cycle parking is replacing existing use of railings. Has this been surveyed at peak?
10. Informal pedestrian crossing in granite
 1. Will retained roundabout really calm traffic enough for this to be safe? Traffic may queue over crossing
11. New Yorkstone paving and seating to improve public space
 1. Cutting traffic on an arm would make a genuine public space here
12. Relocated bus stop and shelter
13. Granite paved inset parking/disabled bays and reduced carriageway width
 1. Disabled bays appear purposely to be near shops at regular intervals. Cycle parking must be the same, cycles are used by a large number of disabled people and a wider set of society for whom cycling is easier than walking. As such the distance for anyone from their cycle to their destination should be minimised, especially in a busy shopping area.
14. Granite paved raised junction including zebra crossing
15. Public realm improvements with Yorkstone in vicinity of station
16. Disabled parking bays and electrical charging bays
 1. Surely a high density of cycle parking at the station should be a priority?
 2. Potential for much higher frequency service from rail station and it provides a very fast route through London which combined with cycling makes for very fast overall journeys.
17. Inset loading bay
 1. Only 1.95m? Surely lorries will overhang this?
18. Inset short stay parking bay
 1. Only 2m wide - will cars not overhang, especially if opening doors?
19. Widened footways over railway bridge
 1. Widened footways in this section are not accompanied by other traffic calming and are in a section which has normally seen high speeds.
 2. Combined with the bus stop and the cut back bus lane this presents a detrimental effect on cycling conditions towards the north of the scheme.
20. Short stay parking and electrical charging bays
21. Informal pedestrian crossing
22. Inset parking and disabled bays
 1. Again, 2m wide, no buffer provided.
23. Relocated bus stop and shelter
24. Raised junction including zebra crossing
25. Widened footway with reduced carriageway width
 1. Widened footway here has no frontage to show need for footfall. Why not use space more imaginatively especially to help people cycling past parked buses?
 2. This appears to be a narrowing to calm entry into scheme. How will the change in speeds work for cycling and why can't this section provide more space for cycling?

Prepared by Alex Ingram on behalf of Lewisham Cyclists