

[REDACTED] (Engineering)

From: [REDACTED] (Engineering)
Sent: 08 July 2020 11:00
To: [REDACTED] (Engineering)
Cc: [REDACTED] (Engineering); [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: CS7 Temp social distancing measures - Tooting Bec to Balham

Hi [REDACTED]

Thanks for the comments and the very useful local knowledge!

My responses are below in red. Apologies for the delay in repsonding

Thanks
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] (Engineering) <[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>
Sent: 25 June 2020 11:48
To: [REDACTED] (Engineering) <[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>; [REDACTED] (Engineering) <[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: CS7 Temp social distancing measures - Tooting Bec to Balham

Hi [REDACTED], apologies for the delay, juggling rather a lot at the moment.
As this is my "local patch" I am especially happy to have a chat about any of my comments if they are not clear.

CSDCS7-RSM-FEA-ZZ-DR-TE-02 (CG)-0006

CS7 TEMPORARY CYCLE PROVISION, SOCIAL DISTANCING MEASURES, SHORT TERM

1. Southbound bus stop on approach to Trinity Road junction – scissor movement risks conflict between buses and cyclists.

It is not known how visible cyclists in the nearside cycle lane will be to bus drivers travelling alongside. At the end of the cycle lane, buses will be moving over to the nearside to pull into the bus stop at the same time as cyclists may need to pull out around any buses in the stop. The short distance between the bus lane and the end of the cycle lane offers limited decision-making time and may increase the risk of sideswipe collisions or cyclists being squeezed against the nearside kerb.

It is recommended that the distance between the end of the cycle lane and the start of the bus lane/bus stop be increased. It is noted that the KWIK FIT access is to be retained and therefore it may be advantageous to terminate the segregation upstream of this point.

There is insufficient space to provide a bus stop bypass to completely segregate cyclists from buses pulling into the stop. Visibility of cyclists in the nearside lane should be good as the segregation proposed is traffic cylinders spaced 4m apart. When the mandatory lane ends there are 2 existing blue CS7 patches on the carriageway alerting buses to the presence of cyclists.

The distance between the end of the cycle lane and the start of the bus lane/bus stop has been increased to 30m

2. General comment. Side road junctions. There is a concern that the alignment of a row of traffic cylinders may form a visual barrier whereby intervisibility to/from vehicles emerging from side road junctions may be reduced to unsafe levels, risking turning collisions/side impacts should vehicles pull onto the main road unsighted.

The positioning of traffic cylinders should be assessed and, if necessary, amended to ensure appropriate levels of intervisibility can be maintained.

The traffic cylinders will be approximately 75mm in diameter and a maximum of 1m high. They will be spaced at least 4m apart. There will be at least 5m offset from each side road kerb line to the start of the row of cylinders.

The design team therefore does not feel that the cylinder placement will adversely affect intervisibility at side road junctions. We believe the proposal is a suitable temporary segregation measure which strikes a balance between providing a physical feature to give cyclists a feeling of safety, whilst not impairing visibility.

CSDCS7-RSM-FEA-ZZ-DR-TE-02 (CG)-0007

1. General comment - No details of traffic signal staging including the pre-signal at Ritherdon Road junction. What is the purpose of the give way markings at the bus gate? There should be nothing to give way to if the left turn is banned?

Staging diagrams have been added and give way markings removed.

2. Comment - Positioning of pre-signal island needs to account for the need to retain delivery access into Argos – deliveries pull in to the gap on the north side of the building next to Brook Close (it is insanely tight and causes problems at present as lorries have to block the road to reverse into the narrow gap). I think it may be ok as the central traffic island is being removed but the indicated traffic cylinder will need to be omitted.

The traffic cylinder has been removed that was blocking the entrance to the off street loading access to Argos. Swept path analysis has been undertaken and the bus presignal island does not appear to prevent access.

Do you know what size lorries they use and do they block the footway or reverse in completely off the public highway?

3. Northbound bus stop at Ritherdon Road junction – sinuous/tight alignment for traffic passing the bus stop risks collisions. The centreline for northbound traffic lanes ends on the junction exit immediately before a sharp left-hand deflection. Traffic in the offside lane may continue ahead without moving across, following the 'natural alignment', risking side swipes with vehicles in the nearside lane who have to move out to avoid the bus stop island. Longer vehicles in the offside lane may overrun the traffic signal island or encroach into the southbound lane if they do attempt to move across.

It is recommended that the northbound layout is reconsidered to provide a smoother alignment and clear lane guidance for all traffic – including warning of the reduction from two lanes to one. Consideration should be given to utilising the relatively wide footway in this location to provide the bus stop bypass (as has been done on the southern section of CS7) in order to allow more space for the complex layout.

I have updated the drawing to add a deflection arrow to alert drivers to the change in alignment and also added a note for the detailed designers to consider appropriate warning signage on the approach.

I've investigated utilising the footway as suggested. This would involve removing the existing lighting column and bus shelter which would add to the construction costs. Using the footway would also significantly narrow it making social distancing more difficult.

4. Local knowledge alert!! There is a junior school at No.217 Balham Park Road (immediately north of the filling station). The footway here becomes very congested at pick-up and drop-off and this will be exacerbated by routing bus users to this point. It may also be busier than usual due to social distancing requirements associated with school drop-offs. I personally feel there is a need to widen

the footway here as there is a real pinch-point created by the poorly positioned tree and existing loading bay with sloped kerb. Access to the gates at the southern end of the school site also needs to be retained and consideration given to the retention of disabled bay. I am happy to talk this one through!

It is recommended that the bus stop is relocated away from the narrow section of footway? I do wonder if we are over complicating this section where a bus and cycle lane could suffice given that bus flows are not that high along Balham High Road?

The design has been updated to retain access to the school gates at the southern end of the building.

I've explored relocating the bus stop but this has not been possible due to the existing road geometry and off street access points which need to be retained. I have been able to widen the footway by 1.5m using traffic cylinders and white line markings. This should make social distancing easier.

I appreciate you know the area well and may be aware of this but it should be noted that the footway on the drawing appears narrower than it is owing to the topo survey having a hoarding line along the eastern footway associated with a past development site. The hoarding made the footway 2.8m wide and was further narrowed by the tree and lighting column. Without the hoarding line the footway is in the region of 4.5m wide. Bus passengers will be able to wait on the floating islands

5. At the same location the cycle lane has significant deflection into the bus stop bypass which may result in cyclists losing control or clipping the kerbs and does not allow for two cyclists to travel side by side which they may be doing as the upstream facility is 3.0m wide.

It is recommended that the deflection into the bus stop bypass is reduced to provide a smoother alignment. It may be necessary to provide warning that the available width is reduced through the bypass.

I've updated the design to taper the cycle lane down over a longer distance on approach to the bus stop by pass.

6. Refuge island west of Elmfield Road. The right turn from Balham High Road into Elmfield Road appears to be very tight due to the provision of the additional traffic island and cycle crossing.

It is recommended that this movement is tracked to ensure the likely vehicle types can complete the manoeuvre without overrunning the island or Elmfield Rd footway.

Cycle crossing removed as the swept paths were too tight

7. Refuge island west of Elmfield Road. It is not clear if the longer vehicles will be able to negotiate the alignment past stationary buses and the central refuge island without overrunning the island. This would risk conflict with waiting pedestrian or loss of control.

It is recommended that vehicle tracking is undertaken to ensure all vehicles are able to negotiate the alignment safely.

Vehicle tracking has been undertaken and works ok – max legal articulated lorry can safely pass the refuge

8. Access to Du Cane Court (southern access) is not specified to be maintained, however, if it is retained. – buses may limit intervisibility to and from the access and may increase the risk of left hook collisions if vehicles turn into the access across cyclists masked by the bus stop.

It is recommended that the operation of this access is clarified and measures taken to achieve appropriate levels of intervisibility at the access/junction as required.

The access to Du Cane Court is proposed to be maintained. Traffic flows in and out are expected to be very low and therefore the risk of conflict also low. Bus frequency at this stop is also low.

A blue patch and cycle logo has been proposed to highlight the presence of cyclists to turning traffic.

CSDCS7-RSM-FEA-ZZ-DR-TE-02 (CG)-0008

1. Northbound approach to Balham Station Road junction. The lane alignment past the bus stop on the approach to the jmay be difficult to negotiate by longer vehicles without them straddling the lane markings at risk of conflict/sideswipes with other traffic. This may be a particular issue when a bus is in the stop and the right turn lane has more than one vehicle present.

The layout should be reviewed with vehicle tracking undertaken to ensure that traffic is able to safely negotiate the alignment. IT may be necessary to move the northbound bus stop further south to provide more space for the required lanes.

Vehicle tracking has been undertaken and for the majority of vehicles the proposed alignment works ok and straddling of the lanes is not likely. For very large articulated lorries lane straddling may occur however this is not expected to be happen often and therefore the risk is low. The road layout is of course temporary and would be reviewed if the proposal was to be made permanent.

Due to the existing road width the bus stop cannot be moved south without extensive civils works which is not appropriate for a temporary scheme. It would also move the stop further away from its current location which we are trying to avoid to minimise passenger inconvenience for the duration of the temporary scheme

2. Floating Loading bay south of Oakmead Road -the cycle lane has significant deflection which may result in cyclists losing control or clipping the kerbs and does not allow for two cyclists to travel side by side which they may be doing as the upstream facility is sufficiently wide.

It is recommended that the deflection into the loading bay bypass is reduced to provide a smoother alignment.

It is recommended that the operation of this access is clarified and measures taken to achieve appropriate levels of intervisibility at the access/junction as required.

The cycle lane width entering the floating bay section is 2.4m wide and then 2m throughout adjacent to the bay. Although the turn is quite abrupt there is sufficient width for cycles to safely travel side by side. This layout is temporary and maximises the amount of parking retained whilst providing a segregated cycle lane

3. General comment – floating loading/disabled bays. There may be accessibility issues at the floating bays due to the presence of the traffic cylinders and absence of dropped kerbs.

Measures should be implemented to ensure the loading facilities are fit for purpose and can be safely accessed by users.

The wands are spaced an absolute minimum of 4m apart behind bays which is adequate to facilitate loading and disabled access. The majority of bays have been floated at the current location. There should therefore already be dropped kerbs. As this is a temporary scheme we are trying to minimise the amount of civils works/permanent changes

From: [REDACTED] (Engineering)

Sent: 24 June 2020 15:10

To: [REDACTED] (Engineering) <[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>; [REDACTED] (Engineering) <[REDACTED]@tfl.gov.uk>

Subject: CS7 Temp social distancing measures - Tooting Bec to Balham

Hi all,

Please can you provide comments on the attached from your respective disciplines? Sponsorship are looking at an extremely quick turnaround for this scheme (surprise surprise) so the sooner the better, thanks!

Many thanks

