London Cycling Campaign

21 July 2016

Kingston Station area mini-Holland

http://consult.kingston.gov.uk/portal/planning/go/consultations_summer_2016/go_cycle_-_kingston_station_area_consultation

This consultation response is on behalf of the London Cycling Campaign, the capital's leading cycling organisation with more than 12,000 members and 40,000 supporters. We welcome the opportunity to comment on plans. Our response was developed with input from the co-chairs of our Infrastructure Review Group and in support of our borough group, Kingston Cycling Campaign's response.

The most efficient road space use is not for private motor vehicles. The London Cycling Campaign therefore generally expects schemes to be designed to accommodate growth in cycling and to reduce motor vehicle traffic – particularly for journeys 5km or less.

In general, the London Cycling Campaign want, as a condition of funding, all "Mini-Holland" highway development designed to London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS), with a Cycling Level of Service (CLoS) rating of 70 or above, with all "Critical Fails" eliminated.

Given that, we wish to raise the following specific points with the scheme and its surrounds:

1. In general, we believe these plans have sacrificed cycling and walking convenience for motor journey times – we do not believe this is appropriate and the reverse should be the approach. If Kingston is serious about its mini-Holland schemes, it must be willing to confront those who oppose cycling schemes. Otherwise the inevitable result will be far weaker schemes.
2. We welcome 20mph speed limits, although as the diagrams are slightly unclear, we want them to be throughout the entire area and scheme.
3. We welcome the proposals to create safe space for cycling separate from motor vehicle traffic, although not the many switches between shared space and segregated cycle tracks.
4. We do not welcome proposals to mix taxis, buses and cycling in some sections. This will never be appropriate for any scheme that aims to enable a much broader range of people to cycle.
5. Crossings for pedestrians and those cycling should be, wherever possible, in a single stage. And side-by-side rather than toucan combined crossings.
6. There is a lack of clarity in drawings in general as to cycle track widths. Widths should adhere to at least LCDS widths for high cycling flow areas.
7. Cycle parking throughout the area should be improved and increased, rather than removed at any point. There are already demonstrable areas of cycle parking stress in Kingston. If schemes are to increase cycling significantly, that means cycle parking must increase also.
8. Station forecourt:
   a. There is a lack of clarity as to whether tracks run around the edges of the area south east of the station, around "The Hub", or whether that is "shared space". Either way, interactions between those cycling and pedestrians should be appropriately managed.

b. The council should be very clear about the purpose of The Hub itself before moving forward. Although it would be a good location for more cycle storage definitely if other viable uses are not identified.
   c. Designs for Fife Road need to be clarified. We are concerned that a lack of clarity and use of "shared space" here without design to reduce speed and potentially traffic volumes will allow drivers to bully cyclists and pedestrians, creating a hostile environment.
   d. West of Fife Street there appears to be a shared space that leads to a cycle track on the southern side of Wood Street. The cycle track should be run up to the crossing at the end of Fife Street.
9. Green Link:
   a. The proposals are unclear but we would support separated facilities for pedestrians and those cycling over the bridge.
   b. The crossing at Skerne Road should be designed to separate people cycling and walking. And all arms should be in a single stage for people cycling and walking if possible, with wide arms. This junction is vital to get right as it currently has a high proportion of poor driver compliance, yet is on several key routes.