Officer comments & observations on TfL A316 Chertsey Road – Cycle review scheme phase A (Option2)

General issues that need to be addressed/considered

1. **Treatment of side road junctions/accesses** – It is believed that with the funding available it is paramount that cycle/pedestrian improvements should be focussed on junctions/accesses. There is a need to reduce the potential conflict between vulnerable road users and motor vehicles at these points. This should be given precedence over improvements on the link between junctions where the potential for conflict is much lower.

   Proposed improvements for cyclists and pedestrians will be consistent along the route. Design to be reviewed to see if there are more opportunities to reduce conflict at junctions.
   Junctions to be reviewed:
   - Alisa
   - Cassilis
   - St George
   - St John's

   There was a desire in the LBRuT Mini-Holland bid that wherever possible the cycle track was to be 'bent out' by approximately 5.0 metres when crossing side roads.

   Appropriate cycle facilities will be proposed at side road junctions. Where possible, 'bent out' facilities will be proposed.

   This was an attempt to reduce the potential for conflict between cyclists crossing the side road coming into conflict with vehicles leaving the A316. It also means that stationery vehicles waiting to join the A316 do not block the pedestrian/cycle routes. This may also offer the opportunity in the future to provide priority to cyclists at some point in the future. This design option does not appear to have been explored by TfL?

   The proposals along the route are subject to be reviewed.

2. **Usable widths of paths –** It is worth noting that although some of the proposed widths of paths may initially sound generous, the usable widths may however be much reduced. It should be assumed that 500mm back from the kerbline is deadspace and needs to be provided as a 'safety margin'. Similarly a boundary fence at the back of footway may similarly reduce the usable width of the adjacent path by 500mm

DRAFT

Agreed. A buffer zone has been incorporated into the design tolerances. It is also acknowledged that property boundaries reduce the effective widths of footways.
Where we propose land take and where possible we will seek to increase the land take to take this into account

3. **Direction of travel –** It should be assumed that all off-road cycle facilities will be used in both directions irrespective of markings placed on the ground.

   Agreed. However, we cannot provide dual width cycle tracks on both sides of the road, this would be financially unfeasible and physically impossible in the pinch point locations.

4. **Loss of central hatch markings on A316 with substandard running lanes on 40mph road –** Is RSA likely to highlight any risks with the removal of central hatching accompanied by narrow general purpose running lanes?

   The proposals along the route are subject to ~~be reviewed.~~the Stage 1 RSA process.

5. **Connections into the Borough's local cycle network –** It would appear that opportunities to improve the connections into the Borough's local cycle network have not been fully explored eg between riverside side routes on the Surrey/Middx sides of the River Thames and Twickenham Bridge. It is paramount that cycle connections between the routes on the A316 and the local borough cycle network are safe and convenient. This will help to maximise use of both networks through the use of off-road facilities on the A316 and adjacent lightly trafficked routes on the Borough's highway network.

   There are proposed tow path connections on the Twickenham Bridge by use of stair rail for cycles.
   The route proposals will be reviewed to ensure that where feasible there are suitable interfaces with adjacent (local) routes.
   This can also take place in the form of additional LCN signing at appropriate locations. Existing LCN to be shown on plan.

6. **Traffic data –** The data supplied for cycle and pedestrian flows appear to be very limited and the recorded flows rather modest. It would be useful to know what additional data may be available, including O&D surveys, to help justify the proposed expenditure/design approaches?

   Additional count data is to be obtained. Pedestrian count data was not undertaken at the earlier stage of the design, but is now agreed to be necessary.

7. **Trees –** The proposed loss of several mature trees may be controversial. It is unclear whether the existing modest cycle and

DRAFT

pedestrian flows make it the loss of all the trees absolutely necessary at this point in time? Perhaps some could be retained until cycle/pedestrian flows have increased and there is a greater risk of conflict.

Trees removal is being kept to a minimum. Large groups or extended lines of trees i.e. adjacent to Twickenham Rubgy Club Car Park are being retained. Any proposal to remove a tree is subject to approval by TfL's Aboriculturist.
The purpose of this scheme was to identify the issues and constraints for providing suitable (and promotable) off-road cycle track facilities between Richmond Circus and Hospital Bridge (full scheme). It is also to encourage future cycling rather than being the minimum requirements for current needs. We have identified the key trees that would require removal to enable this provision at Phase A, as well as keeping landtake to a minimum.

8. **Compulsory purchase/land acquisition –** It is likely that any acquisition of private property from no.s 11-15 The Avenue (between Douglas House and Ailsa Avenue) will be controversial. Might it be better to remove the blue shading and annotate with a more vague description suggesting that further investigation to be given as to what options are available?

   The annotations on the plans may be adjusted accordingly.
   Agreed – however these locations **are the pinch points** and it may be that the current proposals are too politically sensitive and therefore consider taking the routes off the LCN either side of the A316 before St Margaret's R/B.

9. **Consistency of design approach on segregated/unsegregated shared facilities –** would it not be better to have a consistent design approach on this particular link? Possibly unsegregated shared cycle and pedestrian paths throughout in light of the modest cycle and pedestrian flows? This could help the scheme be less 'over engineered', particularly at locations where cyclists could be performing a number of manoeuvres and the marking of cycle tracks is superfluous eg A316/Parkshot junction.

   A shared use facility has been considered as an option along this section of the route.
   However, there are political sensitivities as well as internal TfL business considerations associated with removing existing (inc. sub-standard) cycle tracks in favour of shared u in favour of shared use. In certain locations this could increase accidents due to number of cyclists already using the segregation (e.g. St John's Grove). Thorough consultation and input from the RSA would be sought in these instances.

DRAFT

Specific issues (north side of A316 working from west to east – London bound)

10. Unclear why bollards need to be retained on footway between St Margaret's Road RAB and Ailsa Road – they further narrow the shared path?
    The feasibility of removing the bollards is being investigated. However, it has been suggested that the bollards were installed to address parking issues (especially during Rugby match days). An alternative method of preventing footway parking should be considered – including liaison with enforcement and potential for CCTV provision.

11. Sightlines at the Douglas House Car Park entrance are very poor, particularly for drivers leaving the car park. There is poor visibility of pedestrians/cyclists on the A316 shared path
    The use of adjacent land will contribute towards improved visibility at this vehicular entrance.

12. Noted that private land acquisition proposed between Douglas House Car Park entrance and Ailsa Road. Although this may achieve a measured width of 2.6 metres – the usable width will be approximately 1.6 metres (see point 2 above). This is too narrow to safely promote shared cycle and pedestrian use.
    The proposed widening to over 2.5 metres is an improvement to the footway which is already shared use. Agree.

13. Carriageway running lanes of 2.9m on the A316 between Ailsa Road and The Avenue are very narrow considering the high flows of lorries/coaches on the A316? RSA may flag up risk of head on collisions between opposing traffic flows
    The proposed footway and lane widths can be reviewed. Initial discussions with safety auditors indicates that 2.9m lane widths is acceptable.ODE yet to discuss with Outcome Delivery

14. Path widths and sightlines at the extreme western end of Twickenham Bridge are very narrow/poor. Cyclists travelling westbound likely to be doing so at speed due to downhill gradient and the risk of collision with pedestrians/oncoming cyclists is high – can any path widening in this area be safely achieved?
    The proposals include widening on both sides of the highway i.e. along the verge at the junction with Heathcote Road and on the footway area at the junction with The Avenue. OK

15. The proposed widening of the paths, by 500mm, across Twickenham Bridge appears to offer little improvement for the costs/disruption caused during construction. Would it not be preferable to relocate the existing lamp columns and widen the cycle track within the existing kerbline?

The footway has been widened whilst maintaining sufficient carriageway space for traffic. The cycle track has been widened by removing the outer segregation marking. It is also proposed to relocate the lamp columns (centrally) to improve the use of the footway space for a segregated cycling and walking facility.
The use of lamp columns to assist in the segregation of peds/ cycles is to reduce the loss of footway for street furniture on the footbridge. 0.45m min space form the kerb edge would be required for lamp columns at the edge of footway. Positioning the lamp columns at the back of footway may not be possible due o the structure and wind loading.

16. Section of segregated cycle track/footway between Twickenham Bridge and where the footpath and cycle track split. It would appear that the potentially generous widening of the cycle track will be lost as a result of widening the poorly used footways?

    Would it not be better to keep the footways at their current width (1.2m approx) and any widening allocated to a two-way cycle track including a 500mm safety margin?
    The existing width of the walkway is insufficient. Scheme designs should endeavour to cater for all users, which in this instance includes widening of the cycle track and footway. The safety zone is the grass verge, which is to be converted to footway verge to remove maintenance requirements. This area may therefore be used by cyclists. Agreed.

17. Long delays for cyclists at the existing Toucan crossings at the Pools on the Park access road.
    This is beyond the remit of the brief. Pools in the Park is being considered as a separate scheme.

18. Poor sightlines due to vegetation in the adjoining property at the Richmond/London Scottish Rugby (Athletic Ground) entrance onto the A316.
    The vehicular entrance referred to is outside the extent of the TLRN.

19. Consider providing shared use between Pools on the Park access road and Richmond Circus to shared use.
    ~~A shared use facility has been considered as an option along this section of the route.~~ See Point 17 – TfL is in receipt of new proposals for Pools in the Park.

DRAFT

Specific issues (south side of A316 working from east to west – Country bound)

20. Section west of Parkshot where private land acquisition is proposed. Although the new path width is shown to be approximately 3.6 metres, the usable width will be much reduced. The PGR will be set back 500mm from kerbline, with a further loss of 500mm of usable width off this and the boundary treatment at the back of highway.ie approximately 2.1metres.
    It is acknowledged that the physical boundaries i.e. the PGR and the property boundary reduce the effective width of the shared use footway. The feasibility of removing the guardrail is being investigated. Consideration can be given to increasing the widening of the footway.

21. Section between Pools on the Park footbridge and Old Deer Park car park entrance. As the cycle track on this section is 2.5m (less any safety margin of 500mm) would it not be appropriate to designate this section as shared use to have a consistent design approach on this section
    A shared use facility has been considered as an option along this section of the route.

22. Section between Old Deer Park car park entrance and Twickenham Bridge. Consider reducing footway to1.5m to maximise the width of cycle track ie 3.0metres less safety margin of 500mm?
    Scheme designs should endeavour to cater for all uses. In this instance proposals include improvements to the walkway and cycle track.

23. Twickenham Bridge – is it not preferable to retain unsegregated shared use. Cycle track of 2.1-2.4metres less 500mm safety margin means it is too narrow to promote two-way cycle use.
    A shared use facility has been considered as an option along this section of the route.

24. Section between Twickenham Bridge and Heathcote Road – combination of narrow footway and vehicle restraint systems means that this section is still very narrow, despite proposed widening, to safely promote shared cycle and pedestrian use.
    The proposed widening of the shared use footway is an improvement on the existing cycle and pedestrian facility.

25. Section between Heathcote Road and Cassilis Road – combination of boundary fences at the back of footway, Armco barrier and bollards all conspire to narrow the usable widths very narrow to safely promote shared use. Several vehicle crossover with very poor visibility when vehicles leaving properties to join A316.
    Removal of the barriers and bollards is being investigated. The issue of vehicle access/crossovers along the shared use route could be addressed by modifications to the property boundaries. However this

street layout is similar to other shared use cycle routes adjacent to residential properties.

26. Section between Cassilis Road and St Margarets Road RAB – combination of retaining wall, narrow footway and bollards make this section relatively narrow to promote shared use.
    The proposals may be reviewed to re-consider reducing the width of the planter. Removal of the bollards is being investigated along a section of footway which is already shared use.

Authors [redacted] (Senior Engineers) August 2014

DRAFT