



## **A316 London Road Roundabout – Q&A and Site Visit Notes**

Questions raised by a variety of stakeholders are in bold below followed by TfL's response to each question.

**TfL's plans for London Road roundabout clearly fail to comply with Network Management Act 2004 as they fail to promote the expeditious flow of pedestrian traffic and cycling traffic.**

The Traffic Management Act 2004 places a network management duty on local traffic authorities. This duty is to:

- “manage their road network with a view to achieving, so far as may be reasonably practicable having regard to their other obligations, policies and objectives, the following objectives:
  - a. Securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network; and
  - b. Facilitating the expeditious movement of traffic on road networks for which another authority is the traffic authority”

As you correctly state traffic includes pedestrians and cyclists as well as motorised vehicles. We do not agree that the proposed scheme fails to comply with the network management duty, as it is an improvement upon existing conditions for pedestrians and cyclists and provides measures that are reasonably practicable and affordable with due regard to TfL policies on the provision of traffic signals and journey time reliability. The scheme increases the overall width and length of the traffic island and reduces the effective width of the southbound exit lane allowing pedestrians and cyclists a safe waiting place to cross the road in two parts.

**Can you provide an explanation as to why 'Keep Clear' zones were not considered on the roundabout?**

The traffic signs manual recommends that 'Keep Clear' markings are only used to allow the passage of vehicles into or out of a side road or access. The use of 'Look Left' and 'Look Right' markings are more appropriate where pedestrians and cyclists are crossing at dropped kerbs and are intended in this location to be an indication to drivers of the crossing points, as well as a reminder for pedestrians and cyclists. If there is evidence of vehicles blocking the crossing points we will consider whether it is possible to add white bar markings as a further indication.

**We do not think there been proper consideration of a full range of alternative facilities.**

As we have previously advised, alternative options have been considered for this location, however the presence of several dropped kerb vehicular accesses in this location mean that it is not possible to provide larger refuges or a zebra crossing without excessive deviation from the natural pedestrian and cyclist desire lines.

**We believe the only safe option is to provide toucan crossings across London Road.**

We note your preferred option would be for TfL to provide toucan crossings across all arms of the London Road. When the London Road roundabout was investigated in 2008 two options were considered. It was found that the signalisation of the roundabout within the existing layout was unworkable due to the difficulties that internal stop lines would present for larger vehicles circulating the roundabout in addition to an unacceptable loss of capacity at the roundabout which would cause rat running problems on the surrounding roads.

An alternative option involving converting the roundabout to a signalised crossroad junction was also considered and whilst this was more acceptable in capacity terms there are several utilities services located within the roundabout that would have cost over £870k to divert, in addition to civils works, rendering the project economically unviable. Due to the presence of vehicle crossovers within the area it is not possible to provide stand alone toucan crossings away from the roundabout at a useful distance for pedestrians and cyclists.

**The Mayor has a target of 5% of all travellers being cyclists. For Chertsey Road, this would mean hundreds of cyclists every morning on the cycle lanes provided by TfL running adjacent to the dual carriageway. Please stop to consider whether the facilities you are providing could really safely accommodate this.**

Transport for London is working to achieve a target of a 400% increase in cycling journeys by 2026 and we are confident that the infrastructure proposed to be provided here will be sufficient to cope with such an increase. Pedestrian demand is influenced by many factors aside from infrastructure, including land use of surrounding locations. The expected demand growth of this area does not currently justify the cost and disruption of signalising the roundabout.

It is currently Mayoral policy to limit the growth of traffic signals in London and as such we do not intend to re-investigate the proposal to signalise the roundabout at this present time.

**How does TfL expect people to cross the London Road, through two lanes of moving traffic on the approaches and across a wide lane on the exits with vehicles leaving the roundabout at speed?**

The provision of refuges will provide a safe location for pedestrians and cyclists to wait in the road and make the crossing in two stages. The conversion of the traffic islands to refuges and the increase in their size will alert motorists to the presence of pedestrians and cyclists and encourage a reduction in their speed.

**What makes this junction different from others on the A316, like the next one along at St Margaret’s Road, which is fully signalised?**

St Margaret’s roundabout was signalised on three arms in 1995 prior to TfL’s formation and the adoption of the current policy to limit the introduction of new signals. The size and geometry of St Margaret’s roundabout mean that there is more space for vehicles to “stack” on the roundabout (i.e. wait at internal stop lines without blocking the preceding junction).

**Does TfL recognise the current, and potential, significance of the A316 cycle route as a quasi Cycle Superhighway?**

TfL undertook a CRISP study into the A316 in 2006. A package of measures has been undertaken including upgrades to the cycle tracks on Lower Richmond Road and Lower Mortlake Road, improvements to the cycling facilities at Richmond Circus and the construction of a cycle ramp at Chiswick Bridge. This proposed scheme to replace the traffic islands on the A316 London Road/Chertsey Road roundabout with refuges improves the continuity of this route within the existing constraints which include maintaining journey time reliability for vehicular traffic in this corridor.

**Do you have numbers for current pedestrian and cyclist demand to cross the London Road, north and south of the roundabout?**

Video surveys were undertaken in January 2010. The results from these surveys were as follows:

	Northern arm – London Road		Southern Arm – London Road		Eastern Arm – Chertsey Road		Western Arm – Chertsey Road	
	West-bound	East-bound	West-bound	East-bound	North-bound	Southbound	Northbound	Southbound
AM peak - pedestrians	2	4	0	3	11	36	0	0
AM peak - cyclists	9	8	3	0	2	11	0	0
PM peak - pedestrians	2	1	1	9	19	13	1	0
AM peak - cyclists	2	1	4	0	11	3	0	0

We intend to monitor levels of pedestrian and cycling demand post-completion of the scheme which may help to indicate whether the scheme was successful in releasing suppressed demand.

**Does TfL believe there is “suppressed demand” and is this based on the numbers referred to above?**

TfL believes that there may be a slight increase in cycling and pedestrian demand using the refuges at this location as opposed to the refuges further north and south of the London Road. However we do not believe that there will be significant increases in cycling and pedestrian numbers at this location without major changes to the surrounding land uses. Subject to budget and resource availability we are keen to monitor trends upon the completion of this scheme.

**Was the same methodology used before and after installation of the toucan on the eastern side of the roundabout?**

The toucan crossing on the eastern side of London Road was installed in 2000. Unfortunately due to the length of time that has elapsed we do not have ready access to the “before” data that underpinned this proposal prior to the crossing being introduced.

**In 2008 was it a toucan crossing or signalling the roundabout that would cause severe delays to traffic on all arms of the roundabout?**

The signalisation of the roundabout would have caused severe delays. As indicated during our recent meeting the presence of several dropped kerb accesses nearby mean that we are not able to provide standalone toucan crossings in locations that are close to the pedestrian and cyclist desire lines.

To answer various queries raised regarding how calculations are made regarding triggers to ‘severe’ delays on the network please see our traffic modelling guidelines and auditing process at:

<http://www.tfl.gov.uk/assets/downloads/businessandpartners/traffic-modelling-guidelines.pdf>

and

<http://www.tfl.gov.uk/assets/downloads/businessandpartners/td-map-overview-v3.0.pdf>

As we informed you at the site meeting, any new proposal to signalise the roundabout would need to meet this criteria and the current Mayoral policy is that there should be no net growth of traffic signals on the network.

**What is the effect of the signals at St Margaret’s roundabout and was this considered in coming to the conclusions about London Road?**

As stated above, St Margaret's roundabout was signalised in 1995 prior to TfL's formation, the introduction of the 2004 Traffic Management Act and current Mayoral policy to limit the growth of signals in London. We do not have meaningful data on pedestrian and cycle movements before this scheme was introduced. We are currently in the process of modelling the flow of traffic at the roundabout with a view to providing an at-grade replacement for the footbridge. We cannot commit at this stage that the new crossing will be implemented as several approvals are required internally in addition to public consultation and securing funds for implementation.

**What other policies and actions such as the targets in the Mayor's Transport Strategy to increase cycle journeys by 400% by 2025 and modal share to 5% have been considered?**

TfL and the Mayor are committed to making London a cycle friendly city and are investing in a wide variety of measures to achieve this target including the delivery of the Barclay's Cycle Hire and Cycle Superhighways major schemes, cycle training, cycle safety and infrastructure improvements, measures to improve cycle security, awareness and promotion activities relating to cycling, enforcement against irresponsible road user behaviour, and encouraging workplaces to provide secure cycle parking and showering facilities. The boroughs also invest in cycling improvements through their Local Implementation Plans funding.

For more information on the wide range of cycling programmes, please see the following link to the Cycling Revolution document and Cycling Revolution end of year review available from the following link:  
<http://tfl.gov.uk/roadusers/cycling/15459.aspx>

In May this year £4m was awarded to the 13 Biking Boroughs with the aim to achieve a step change in cycling in Outer London. This money will be spent on a variety of cycling initiatives to create cycling communities, cycle hubs and raise the profile of cycling within the boroughs. This month, two new Barclay's Cycle Superhighways routes have been launched and work has begun on the expansion of the Barclay's Cycle Hire scheme in central London.

**What consideration was given to the current and potential significance of the cycle route, comparable to the Cycling Superhighways in reducing congestion on this strategic road by encouraging a modal shift to cycling?**

See responses above to your questions **Does TfL believe there is "suppressed demand" and is this based on the numbers referred to above?** and **Does TfL recognise the current, and potential, significance of the A316 cycle route as a quasi Cycle Superhighway?**

**Does TfL recognise the London Road roundabout as a significant break in continuity on a strategic cycle route?**

TfL does recognise the existing layout of London Road roundabout as a break in continuity. This recognition has led to our current proposal. We propose to reduce this break through the continuation of the shared use cycle paths and the creation of refuges to enable more continuous journeys.

**What consideration was given to the movement of pedestrians and cyclists?**

The needs of pedestrians and cyclists have been considered by providing the refuges that are an improvement on the existing situation within the site constraints.

TfL has a duty to manage competing demands for allocation of roadspace on its network and needs to take all road users into account. A reduction in capacity on this strategic corridor would result in a proportion of traffic seeking less suitable alternative routes.

**What are the ‘less suitable alternative routes’?**

The less suitable alternative routes would be the primarily residential roads running parallel to the A316 and controlled by the London Borough of Richmond. A specific example of this is Cole Park Road where there have been complaints of traffic utilising the road to bypass the London Road roundabout.

**How is “increased queuing” measured, expressed and predicted?**

Please see our modelling guidelines (as per links in answer to your question **In 2008 was it a toucan crossing or signalling the roundabout that would cause severe delays to traffic on all arms of the roundabout?**)

**Note of Meeting on site – 15 July**

Note of meeting with stakeholders at London Road/Chertsey Road roundabout on A316 – 15.07.11. The following questions were mainly directed from Tim Harris/Cllr Elloy and Nick Tittle.

**The width of the southern arm of the London Road on TfL’s plan following the improvements will still be 7.4m where as on the northern arm it is 5.4m why is this? Can nothing be done to address the fact that the southern arm is still 2 lanes wide (ie reduce the lane widths)? Tim Harris does not think that people will use the improvements as they do not go far enough to assist and it is easier to go a little further up London**

**Road (at the 30mph sign point) and cross where there is less flowing traffic.**

We are revising our proposals to reduce the southbound lane width as a result of our discussions. The London Borough of Richmond has indicated that they would be unhappy with any proposal that would involve reducing the approach lanes from London Road onto the roundabout from two to one.

**It is not possible to get across both arms southbound particularly at rush hour in one go, a toucan crossing at this point would address this problem. There is no deflection on southern arm so traffic can approach at 40mph – Tim Harris’s view is that the only solution to this is to signalise the junction. Could a toucan crossing go on the northern arm 100 yards down from London Road?**

Provision of a toucan at this location would be the responsibility of LB Richmond. This aside, we would have concerns that such provision could lead to pedestrians and cyclists being directed down a relatively narrow footway and adding 200 yards to journeys. This would increase conflict between pedestrians and cyclists and realistically few people would make this deviation away from their desire lines.

**Why is there inconsistency at this roundabout with other roundabouts (St Margarets) along the Chertsey Road?**

See previous responses above.

**Speed of traffic entering northern arm is too fast for cyclists. Why can't the cost of a straight across crossing be prioritised here?**

See previous explanation above regarding costs to relocate utilities under the roundabout.

**How much is the Richmond Circus scheme worth?**

£846,000. This included extensive resurfacing works. Please note this scheme was planned and implemented prior to the 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review, the effect of which has been to reduce Transport for London's budget by approximately 20 per cent for the following three financial years.

**The toucan at the Chertsey Road arm does in fact let traffic out of the northern arm of London Road. Can the toucan's settings be set to manage the traffic better on the roundabout**

As advised at the meeting, that toucan is dependent upon demand and thus this would not be possible

**Nick Tittle requested a copy of the 2008 report**

Enclosed with this Q&A.

**Has the solution for the roundabout purely been based on the fact that the removal of the roundabout is a costly one? Could this not be revisited, or put on a wait list until sufficient funding became available?**

We do not believe that there would be sufficient benefits at this location to justify this expenditure. Given the current financial constraints, and the policy on limiting the growth of traffic signals it is not practical to consider this solution at present.

**Could we do a single lane into the southern arm?**

Traffic already exits the roundabout in one lane. We have reduced the width of the lane to 5.7m following our discussions on site.

**Could 'Keep Clear' markings next to the southern road refuge?**

See response above regarding 'Keep Clear' markings.

**Why is a Zebra crossing option not viable at the southern arm?**

There are issues surrounding dropped kerb accesses to properties and the fact that cyclists do not legally have priority over motor vehicles at crossings. Whilst there is more space on the northern arm, this falls within the area where LB Richmond is the highway authority. We would also have concerns over the excessive deviation away from the pedestrian and cyclist desire line that would result and the limited footway space at this location.

**Why is a toucan crossing on the northern arm not an option?**

As we advised at the site meeting, a toucan crossing on the northern arm would block access to property.

**Please provide calculations used on vehicular/cycling etc?**

The design standards for traffic signals in London is guidance that TfL currently uses and is based upon DfT guidance. At the site visit we agreed to provide you with copies of the TSRDG and the Traffic signs Manual, please find links to both documents below.

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2002/3113/contents/made>

Traffic signs manual

<http://www2.dft.gov.uk/pgr/roads/tss/tsmanual/trafficsignsmanualchapter5.pdf>

Ends.