CS7 – Sections 6 and 5 – Interim Works
RSA1 comments
email dated 04-11-21
Designer Comments date 05-11-21

Auditor Comments in BLACK – designer responses in BLUE

Sheet 1 (Colliers Wood)

1. The short section of bus lane is a bit random – does not tie in with zig-zags and does not appear to be continued up or downstream?
   Bus lane is proposed to provide additional carriageway space for cyclists following the removal of the floating bus-stop and cycle facilities. Whilst the bus lane could appear a little un-orthodox the bus stop itself within a cycle lane is a standard layout.

2. Buses in the stop will limit visibility to the nearside signals and intervisibility to/from peds on the east side of the crossing. Under current layout, buses block the lane so limited risk of vehicles overtaking the bus. Peds crossing out of phase may be at increase risk of collision.
   Whilst potentially the nearside traffic signal at the crossing could be masked by a stationary bus there are two additional signals installed at the crossing (nearside secondary and off-side additional primary signals) providing adequate traffic signal visibility.

3. Removal of floating bus stop is a reduction in provision/safety for cyclists – admittedly not worse than pre-covid layout but consider returning stop to original location upstream to reduce the crossing viz issue in 2.
   Bus stop location retained to improve the modal connectivity to the rail station without bus passengers needing to cross the side road to access the LU station.
   The original bus stop location has greatly reduced overall carriageway width (combined with the north bound cycle lane) allowing passing widths of below 2m and a narrow north bound lane potentially leaving to side swipes from vehicles attempting to overtake a stationary bus.

Sheet 2 (Cavendish Road - Colliers Wood)

4. Is there a reason you are not returning the bus stop to previous layout? Pushing stop closer to petrol station access reduces intervisibility for exiting vehicles when buses in stop.
   Bus stop (not cage) location tested with tracking to allow a max legal articulated lorry to pass a stationary bus at the stop. This location also permits a second bus to stop behind the first and alight passengers as requested by Bus Operations. Note that this practise is envisaged to happen in the original bus cage location. Whilst agree visibility could be slightly reduced to vehicles exiting the garage it is not expected to be unduly worse than the original layout.

5. Only 2 zig zags on northbound approach to crossing is less than at present (and previous) and reduces driver awareness of the crossing.
   X4 Zig Zag markings are shown for the northbound approach (2 new and 2 existing)

6. Can you put an offside signal on the island to mitigate effect of buses on signal visibility?
   Traffic signal visibility should be improved over the original layout owing to the slight south bound stop location for a bus. The traffic signal design would have been based off this original layout and designed accordingly.

Sheet 3 (Briscoe Road)

7. Is the cross section adequate if a lorry uses the loading bay? E.g. can two opposing buses get past – probably ok but worth checking.
   Proposed bay width of 2.1m mimics the original inset provisions. Retailers noted a 7.5ton was the largest vehicle that would use the bay and thus dimensions should be adequate. Both general traffic lanes are 3m in width although agreed tight for 2.55m bus widths passing should be possible; note this scenario is not expected to be a regular occurrence.

Sheet 4 (Carlwell Street)

8. Appears to largely return to previous layout therefore no comments.
   Agreed the markings and lane designations return to the original layout.

Sheet 5 (Aldis Street)

9. Suggest the first one or two southbound cylinders be removed to ease cycle movement back into cycle lane when cyclists are overtaking buses.
   TOPO error. DWG was based off the original DD however no cylinders are present in this location (streetview and new TOPO)

10. Potentially quite tight for cyclists overtaking a stationary bus in the 4.0m bus lane given relatively narrow adjacent lane width.
    Whilst agreed tight 4.0m is the minimum bus lane width for such activities and should therefore be suitable

Sheet 6 (Tooting Broadway)

11. Appears to largely return to previous layout therefore no comments.
    Agreed the markings and lane designations return to the original layout.

Sheet 7 (Tooting Bec)

12. Is left turn into Dafforne Road banned? Loss of cylinder in middle of junction may facilitate vehicles turning in?
    Dafforne Rd is No Entry from Upper Tooting Rd and No Right Turn on exit. Traffic cylinders have been amended as noted to maintain the cylinders across the entry lane.

13. Northbound largely as per pre-covid layout therefore no further comments.
    Agreed the markings and lane designations return to the original layout.

Sheet 8 (Balham)

14. Increased risk of left hook conflicts for northbound cyclists especially those used to the banned turn. Only partially mitigated by the proposed markings through the junction.
    Carriageway markings and lane designations return to the original layout with the re-introduction of the left turn into Chestnut Grove. Note original traffic counts (2017) indicated minimal left turn numbers ~50pcu/Hr and no HGVs. Collision stats prior covid did not indicate the left turn was an issue for cyclists.
    Note junction is to be Modernised around April 2022 with LLCS and cycle early starts