

## **LONDON BOROUGH OF RICHMOND UPON THAMES**

### **Cabinet Member Decision**

**DATE:** 2 March 2012

**REPORT OF:** Cabinet Member for Highways and Street Scene

**LEAD OFFICER:** Aurang Zeb – Head of Highways and Transport

**SUBJECT:** A305 Richmond Road - Introduction of advisory cycle lanes between Rosslyn Road & Richmond Bridge

**WARDS:** Twickenham Riverside Ward

**KEY DECISION?:** NO

**IF YES, IN FORWARD PLAN?:** NO

**For general release**

#### **1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

- 1.1 To approve the introduction of an advisory cycle lane improvements on the north east bound carriageway of the A305 Richmond Road.

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.2 As part of the Transport for London Corridors, Neighbourhoods and Supporting Measures, works are proposed to introduce an advisory cycle lane to improve the safety and comfort of cyclists.

#### **2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 **It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Traffic approves the scheme shown in drawing 2240.CS.GL001 attached at Annex A.**

#### **3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 The A305 Richmond Road between Rosslyn Road and Richmond Bridge is an important and well used cycle route serving Richmond Bridge and Richmond Town Centre. The automatic cycle counters on this section of Richmond Road have recorded 600-1000 cyclists per day using the road during the summer months.
- 3.2 Poorly positioned traffic queuing north east towards Richmond Bridge can obstruct cycle movements, particularly during the morning peak hours.

#### **4 DETAIL (Proposal and effects)**

- 4.1 It is proposed to introduce a 1.30 metre wide Advisory Cycle Lanes (ACL) on the north east bound carriageway to encourage queuing traffic to keep the kerb line clear of obstructive vehicles. The ACL and the existing "At any time" waiting restrictions should ensure that cyclists travelling along Richmond Road towards Richmond Bridge have uninterrupted access.
- 4.2 It is not intended to surface the ACL with coloured surfacing. Although improvements have been made in the colour fastness and durability of the surfacing, it may fail before the new carriageway surfacing material and become an additional maintenance liability (over and above the costs of laying the material). The look of the surfacing can detract from the urban realm and for some cyclists the uneven/rough finish can be uncomfortable when compared with carriageway surfacing.
- 4.3 As part of the works the opportunity will be taken to refresh all the existing white line carriageway markings as they have faded.

#### **5 CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 A public consultation was undertaken in December 2011/January 2012 with immediate frontagers living and trading on Richmond Road consulted by means of a mail drop. A total of 251 consultations were delivered, with a total of 24 responses received giving a response rate of 9.6%. In addition the consultation was advertised on the Council's website with a total of 7 responses.
- 5.2 A total of 20 respondents supported the proposed improvements, 9 did not support them, with 2 offering no opinion.
- 5.3 The results of the consultation are summarised with an Officer response where appropriate at Annex B (below).

#### **6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 The costs of the works is estimated at £3,000 and will be funded by the TfL Local Implementation Plan (LIP) funding.

#### **7 POLICY IMPLICATIONS/CONSIDERATIONS**

- 7.1 UDP policy TRN 6 – Traffic Management and Road Safety -The Council will develop and introduce traffic management and other measures aimed at improving road safety.
- 7.2 UDP policy TRN 11 – Cycling -The Council will seek to provide practical facilities for the safe and convenient movement of cyclists, including the development of a local cycle route to complement the London Cycle Network. New development must be designed to give high priority to cycle facilities and to link to the cycle route network and include secure parking in accordance with standards. It will also seek to provide and support the provision of secure parking areas for cycles in shopping and leisure centres, public transport interchanges and other public buildings. The design of new development

must give high priority to cycle access and connecting into the cycle route networks

- 7.3 UDP policy TRN 21 On street parking - The Council will pursue the control of on-street parking where this is necessary to ensure the safe and efficient movement of motor vehicles, public transport, pedestrians, and cyclists, to maintain essential access to premises fronting the roadway, to provide loading bays to improve the local environment or to maintain the vitality of shopping centres. Where parking congestion is so severe that an equitable balance between conflicting demands cannot be achieved, the Council will promote the introduction of Controlled Parking Zones.

## **8 EQUALITY IMPACT CONSIDERATIONS**

- 8.1 The proposals have been subject to an independent road safety audit.

## **9 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 The Traffic Management Act 2004 places a statutory duty on all local authorities to keep cars, buses, bicycles, pedestrians and all other forms of traffic moving on their network of roads and street, and to work with other traffic authorities for the benefit of the wider network, and of course all road users.

## **10 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 10.1 The Council is committed to promoting sustainable travel. This is achieved through a range of policies and activities but encouraging use of public transport, walking and cycling is a key element of this policy. The proposed scheme will make a positive contribution to the environment by reducing congestion, air and noise pollution.
- 10.2 The improvements will promote the use of cycling journeys in Twickenham and the Borough generally. The provision of improved cycle routes should encourage more people to cycle as an alternative to the car and thus reduce volumes of traffic and congestion.

## **11 BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:**

Local Implementation Plan  
Working File  
London Cycling Design Standards

## **12. CONTACTS**

Aurang Zeb  
Head of Highways & Transport  
020 8487 5432  
[aurang.zeb@richmond.gov.uk](mailto:aurang.zeb@richmond.gov.uk)

Robert Parsey  
Senior Engineer  
Highways & Transport  
020 8487 5284  
[robert.parsey@richmond.gov.uk](mailto:robert.parsey@richmond.gov.uk)

Annex B

<b>A305 Richmond Road - Introduction of advisory cycle lanes between Rosslyn Road &amp; Richmond Bridge</b>		
<b>Consultation Responses</b>		
	<b>Summary of additional comments provided (No in brackets indicates the number of times comment made)</b>	<b>Officer response (where required)</b>
a	Cycle lanes should be provided on both side of Richmond Road and transfer pay and display parking bays on Richmond Road into side roads.(4)	There is insufficient carriageway width to introduce advisory cycle lanes on the south-west bound carriageway without the removal of existing on-street parking bays. There is limited on-street parking for Richmond Road businesses and the loss of existing parking could have a detrimental effect on traders. Relocating pay and display bays into side roads would reduce the amount of residents parking in residential roads, be less convenient for those visiting Richmond Road businesses and encourage turning manoeuvres in residential streets.
b	The proposed improvements will not make it safer for cyclists and may give them a false sense of security The solution is to segregate the cycle lanes from the carriageway using horizontal bollards/kerbs. (2)	There is insufficient carriageway width to physically segregate cyclists from motor vehicles. At certain times vehicular traffic may need to enter the proposed cycle lane eg Loading outside the peak hours. Larger vehicles may need to occasionally to enter the advisory cycle lane when vehicles are turning right into side roads.
c	Can the cycle lane be painted blue similar to that used on the Cycle Super Highways? (1)	The cycle lane will not be surfaced with coloured surfacing as it detracts from the urban realm. It is expensive to lay and maintain coloured surfacing.
d	The cycle lane should be extended over the bridge to the mini-roundabout on the east side to encourage motor traffic to keep away from the kerb and allow enough space for cyclists to ride on the carriageway. As cyclists feel “squeezed” some feel that they need to ride on the footway across the Bridge.(1)	There is insufficient carriageway width on the bridge to introduce a cycle lane in one or both directions. Preference would normally be given to providing a facility for cyclists in the uphill direction (north-east bound) as this is where there is the biggest speed difference between cyclists and motor vehicles.
e	The omission of a cycle lane across Richmond Bridge is problematic.	Sharrows are cycle logos with ahead arrows used to indicate to

	<p>Accepting that it is too narrow for a cycle lane implies that it is too narrow for other vehicles to overtake cyclists safely. Some means of indicating to cyclists that they should “take the lane” and to drivers that they should expect cyclists to do so is needed. Propose Sharrows? (2)</p> <p>Alternatively remove the existing centre-line and mark advisory 1.50 metre advisory cycle lanes in each direction to indicate to drivers they should wait behind cyclists and only overtake when there is adequate space (1).</p>	<p>cyclists where they should be positioned in the carriageway. They may be of limited use in the uphill direction as most cyclists are travelling slowly and all but the most confident/assertive of cyclists are likely to position themselves to stop vehicles from overtaking.</p> <p>This innovative solution has been used on “quiet country lanes” but is not an appropriate design solution on a principal road with significant traffic flow and a high proportion of buses.</p>
g	<p>The proposed cycle lane does not link up at either end. There is a contra-flow cycle path on the footway of Rosslyn Road can the proposed cycle lane be extended westwards to link to that rather than starting at an arbitrary point some way into the road? (2)</p>	<p>It is accepted that the proposed cycle lane is not a continuous facility. The future introduction of a Toucan/parallel crossing at the Richmond Road/Rosslyn Road junction may offer an opportunity to provide a continuous connection between the Rosslyn Road cycle contraflow and the proposed cycle lane. Unfortunately there is insufficient funding/ TfL signal section capacity to undertake this work in 2011/12.</p>
h	<p>A cycle lane width of 1.30 metres is inadequate for times when vehicular traffic is freeflowing,. The London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS) has guidance which states that cycle lanes should be a minimum of 1.50 metres wide, and ideally 2.00 metres. The cycle lanes should be marked at 1.50 metres and accept that larger vehicles will encroach within the lane. (3)</p>	<p>There are many examples where advisory cycle lanes of less than 1.50 metres provide a safe and convenient facility for cyclists, particularly when vehicular traffic is stationary or slow moving.</p>
i	<p>Consideration should be given to making the proposed cycle lane mandatory and the existing double yellow lines removed to provide a more comfortable running surface for cyclists. (1)</p>	<p>The introduction of mandatory cycle lane requires the making of a statutory Traffic Management Order (TMO) and erection of large time plates. Advisory Cycle Lanes do not require TMO's/time plates and the underlying waiting restrictions are likely to be enforced more regularly by Civil Enforcement Officers rather than the Police enforcing a moving traffic offence for vehicles entering a mandatory (part time) cycle lane.</p>
j	<p>The bus stop is discontinuous past the existing bus stop cage. Can consideration be given to enlarging the existing bus bay so that stationary buses do not block cyclists or alternatively create an off-</p>	<p>It is standard practice for a cycle lane to be interrupted at bus stops as it is assumed that buses are only stationery for relatively short periods. The enlarging of the bus bay is likely to be expensive, whilst</p>

	road cycle path around the back of the bus stop?	the alternative of providing a cycle track behind the bus stop could mean that cyclists lose priority when they rejoin the carriageway.
k	There is an issue on Richmond Road between Cresswell Road and Morley Road where six parking bays on the southbound carriageway leaves only 2.4metres for southbound traffic. This is just adequate for cars but vehicles wider than cars have no option but to cross into the northbound carriageway in order to pass forcing northbound traffic into the left hand side of their lane adjacent to the kerb. With the present road markings, it is still possible for the two traffic streams to flow simultaneously, but a mandatory lane would, if it were obeyed result in one way working along this stretch of road. If it were not obeyed or were not mandatory, this stretch of cycle lane would be ineffective when there is heavy traffic in either direction	An advisory cycle lane has been proposed as it is recognised that larger vehicles may need to occasionally encroach into the cycle lane.
<b>General Comments</b>		
l	The proposed scheme is a waste of time and money. (2)	The is only a modest cost associated with the marking of an advisory cycle lane as no Traffic Management Order/timeplates are required. It is proposed that the markings would be laid at the same time as the existing faded markings are refreshed.
m	The road is too narrow to accommodate the suggested improvements (4)	Traffic lanes are generally wide enough for most vehicles not to overrun the centre-line or the proposed advisory cycle lanes. It is acceptable for larger vehicles to occasionally encroach into the Advisory Cycle Lane if it is safe to do so.
n	The traffic situation is already dangerous and there have been several major accidents this year. The additional car parking spaces on the corner of Cambridge Road and Richmond Road and loss of traffic lights at the junction give rise to unseen/oncoming traffic/cyclists. There are many near misses from cars turning right into Cambridge Road. (2)	The scheme has been independently safety audited and this has not highlighted concern that an advisory cycle lane will have a detrimental effect on highway safety.
o	Can you change the 'No Cycling' sign at St Stephen's Passage so there is a diagonal red bar on it and 'No Cycles Plate'? (1)	Officers will investigate what additional signage may be required to stop cyclists from riding along St Stephen's Passage.
p	The proposals will make it more convenient and safer for cyclists using Richmond Road. (2)	
q	Could this narrow street (Richmond Road) be closed to large trucks	The A305 Richmond Road/Richmond Bridge forms part of the primary

	and lorries that are dangerous, noisy and shake the flats and the beautiful old bridge? (1)	road network and further restrictions on the type of vehicles able to use the road may be undesirable/difficult to achieve. Richmond Bridge is subject to an existing 18 tonne environmental weight limit to prevent the largest vehicles from crossing the bridge
r	Cyclists reduce pollution and are much safer road users; they are more likely to ride considerately if they have good quality cycle lanes. (1)	
s	Would the Council consider introducing a 20mph limit from Rosslyn Road northbound would be appropriate here all the way through to Richmond Circus, but including Richmond Bridge would be essential. (1)	In the future consideration could be given to making Richmond Town Centre (and Richmond Bridge) part of a 20 mph limit, although this would fall outside the remit of the proposed advisory cycle lane scheme.