

Overall, do you support our proposals for Westminster Bridge, Westminster Bridge Road, Addington Street and Lambeth Palace Road?

Yes

What cycle facilities would prefer to see on Westminster Bridge?

A 1.8m wide segregated cycle track

Please tell us why below

We believe that there are multiple options for the bridge itself that would provide protected space but not require such a sacrifice of space in the width of track. "Semi" or "light" segregation using armadillos could potentially be used, or a "hybrid" or "stepped" track. Both would provide more space than full segregation, and much of the safety and perception of safety benefit. It would be vital that the resulting track is wide enough to provide for pedestrian overspill into the track (as this already often happens), as well as for cyclists to overtake each other without risk.

Better and regular enforcement is also needed to deal with illegal and anti-social behaviour currently happening on the bridge. And we would suggest coloured paint or markings in track to sufficiently delineate them from the pavement at this high footfall location.

Most welcome would be a radical redesign of at least the bridge element of the scheme. A bidirectional track on the south side of the bridge would link into the East-West Cycle SuperHighway far better (see <https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/cycling/621a251d>) than the current "with flow" tracks. Such a track could theoretically be continued around the outside of the junction (as <http://maidstoneonbike.blogspot.co.uk/2015/11/westminster-bridge-road-consultation.html> demonstrates).

Do you think the new crossing on Westminster Bridge Road would improve your journey through the area?

Yes

Do you have any further comments about our overall proposals?

The London Cycling Campaign is the capital's leading cycling organisation with more than 12,000 members and 40,000 supporters. We welcome the opportunity to comment on these plans and our response has been developed in partnership with the chairs of our Infrastructure Review Group and the local Lambeth Cyclists.

We welcome the scheme in general – for its removal of the existing and dangerous roundabout layout, and widespread use of protected space for cycling including junctions that separate cyclists from motor vehicle traffic in time and space. That said, we have specific issues with the scheme as listed below and above, regarding the bridge specifically.

We would suggest that the bus lanes are marked as bus and cycle lanes – in case cyclists wish to leave the track and join the carriageway. In the same vein, the north-south bus service lane behind the hotel should be clearly signed as a cycle facility also.

At the end of the bridge, Section 106 funding money has still yet to be spent to improve the link for cyclists and pedestrians from the bridge to NCN4 at Belvedere Road. A design that allows for safe and calm interaction between all road users should not be beyond the ability of TfL, Lambeth Council and landowners Shirayama to achieve.

Moving on to the roundabout itself, a lack of measurements means we must raise two concerns. Firstly, that all tracks and lanes should be a minimum of 2m wide ideally. Secondly, the separate cycle signals could introduce significant delays to cyclists. Without access to the signal diagrams and timings it's impossible to evaluate this appropriately – but the general rule should be that cyclists should not be excessively disadvantaged in wait time compared to motor vehicles, so cycle cross time should be maximised and wait time minimised.

To be clear, the London Cycling Campaign welcomes the innovative use of signals at this location to maximise cyclist safety by separating cyclists in time and space from motor vehicle traffic. That said, we would welcome even more, the maximising of signal time for cycling and also removing signal waits where unnecessary. For instance, intermittent segregation measures around the bends would allow northbound cyclists travelling around the Park Plaza to bypass signals altogether and move at the same time as traffic. The same approach could avoid signal waits for cyclists turning left onto the roundabout from all spur roads.

If signals will result in long waits compared to motor vehicles, current cyclists may choose to remain on the carriageway – if this is unavoidable, please ensure relevant lane widths do not fall within current CLOS “critical fail” widths, and ensure hook risks are mitigated (in fact the scheme should ensure no critical fails), and that the design is appropriate for likely “shortcuts” (e.g. York Road to Westminster Bridge Road and vice versa).

To further facilitate such movements while maximising safety for cyclists and convenience for pedestrians we would suggest that wherever possible staggered crossings for pedestrians are avoided. Particularly on York Road – as this will facilitate informal crossing from track to service road – and encourage cyclists to stay out of the carriageway.

The cycle track arrows also do not all point in the direction of travel – which might confuse cyclists. For instance, the arrow from Addington Street crossing Station Approach and Westminster Bridge Road points right, rather than ahead.

In general, protection on the cycle tracks should run as close to the mouths of side roads, business access driveways and any other places where there must be a break in segregation. This ensures vehicles turning across the track are appropriately slowed.

Finally, and again in general, the London Cycling Campaign would like to see all schemes given a CLOS rating (as well as adhering to the latest London Cycle Design Standards) that demonstrates significant improvement from the current layout will be achieved for cycling, and that eliminates all “critical fails” in any proposed design before being funded for construction, let alone public consultation.