

## **1. Problem/s Stated by Highway Authority at Identified Location/s** **Stanley Road, Teddington**

“Residents have reported ongoing issues with vehicles parking on the zigzag markings on the approaches to the Stanley Road zebra crossing and illegal manoeuvres associated with the one way restrictions at the junction of Fulwell Road and Stanley Road. The development site is opposite the junction of Fulwell Road and Stanley Road, just north of the Stanley Road zebra crossing.”

[Report to Cabinet Member 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011](#)

## **2. Solution/s Proposed by Highway Authority**

“Introduction of a central refuge on the zebra crossing outside the parade of shops, just south of the development, to shorten the crossing distance and discourage parking on the zigzag markings;

Footway widening at the junction of Fulwell Road and Stanley Road to improve the start of the one way working.”

[Report to Cabinet Member 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011](#)

### **2.1 Subsequent Variation to Solution/s Proposed by Highway Authority**

#### **2.1.1 Stanley Road zebra crossing**

“Consideration was given to widening the footways both sides but this had cost implications from additional drainage in addition to having an impact on cyclists who would be forced to follow the new kerb line.”

#### **2.1.2 Fulwell Road one-way street**

“With regards to Fulwell Road, we consulted on a build out on one side at the Stanley Road junction. Following detailed discussions with Tiles of Wisdom this was dropped from the proposals and we are now focussing on improved signage around the junction to deter vehicles from exiting the wrong way. There will also be significant footway work around this junction due to additional ducting requirements and posts required for the new signage. It is also proposed to upgrade a number of street lights around the zebra crossing as part of this scheme.”

**Principal Traffic Engineer, Highways and Transport**

## **3. RCC Responses to the Proposed Solution/s**

“These are two different problems at two different locations which presumably have been brought together because they are in the same geographic area covered by the section 106 planning conditions. We should distinguish between them when responding to the Council.”

“Interesting that on the map the Council gave us there are only 2 cycle collisions along Stanley Road, both in this area, by the York and Fulwell Road junctions.”

### **3.1 Stanley Road zebra crossing**

#### **3.1.1 Is the proposal a solution to the stated problem?**

“It is not clear how a central island prevents parking on zigzags. If there is likely to be adjacent parking then small kerb build-out along the zigzags would give a consistent lane width.”

“Given that there’s always parking there I don't see why footway build-out to the same width would be a problem for cyclists. Consistent width is better than widenings and narrowings.”

### **3.1 Stanley Road zebra crossing**

#### **3.1.1 Is this a solution to the stated problem?**

“Looking at [Google Street View](#) south over the zebra crossing shows how little room there is between the on-coming car and the one parked on the nearside. An on-coming cyclist would take up the lane to pass the parked cars and avoid being hit by a door. However, they may, with the best intentions, then move to the nearside into the gap created by the zigzag prompting the on-coming car to overtake, which is against the law. If the cyclist continues to take the lane up to, and through, the crossing in anticipation of the bus stop and parked cars on the north side the risk is the on-coming car will accelerate to get past them before the planned central reservation, which is against the law and risks a collision. Building the footway out stops cars from parking within the zigzags because they would block the road and makes it clear a vehicle cannot overtake before the crossing.”

#### **3.1.2 Carriageway Width**

“You have to be careful with pedestrian refuges. If the gap is less than 4.5m they are no good for cycling as motor vehicles cannot overtake cyclists safely and cyclists are coerced into battling for primary position or pushed into the gutter. A gap of 3m or less would be acceptable as it would discourage motor vehicles from overtaking.”

“From a cycling point of view central refuges can be a problem as they create pinch points with dangerously close overtaking. Ideally each side should have a 4.5m gap which means that any vehicle would have space to pass a cyclist safely. This is not an option here so the next best would be a gap of no greater than 3m so that overtaking at the crossing is impossible. As this is a bus route 3m is probably the minimum acceptable to the company - this would match the crossing at the north end of Waldegrave Road that is also on a bus route.”

"A minimum gap of 4m is recommended unless additional features to significantly reduce motor vehicle speeds are incorporated. If... significant numbers of HGVs or buses are expected, it is worth considering increasing this minimum further. Gaps of between 2.75 metres and 3.25 metres over any distance should be avoided, as car drivers may attempt to overtake even though there is insufficient room to do so safely."

#### **DfT Local Transport Note 2008 - Cycle Infrastructure Design**

“As a general rule wide profiles over 4.5m are recommended and critical sections between 2.75 and 4.5m should be avoided. In practical terms, however, where narrow sections are constrained by kerbs e.g. at pinch points or refuges the distance between kerbs is likely to be 3.0m to accommodate the swept paths of large vehicles (i.e. where their passage through the narrowing cannot be guaranteed to be in a straight line). Where such narrowings are introduced, other measures to reduce speeds should be introduced to discourage motorists from speeding up to overtake cyclists on the approach to these features.”

#### **Cycling England**

## Richmond Cycling Campaign Response to Planned Highway Engineering Works

“The pinch point may have an effect on the southbound right turn into Princes Road, a common route for cyclists travelling to Bushy Park: it may make it easier.”

### **3.2 Fulwell Road one-way working**

“It doesn't appear that the works at Fulwell Road will affect cyclists.”

## **4. RCC Proposed Additional Works at the Identified Location/s**

### **4.1 Enforcement**

“I regularly see police officers on their bikes in this area, aren't they supposed to enforce the zigzags or at least tell drivers to move on? Is this scheme implying that there is no enforcement/ineffectual enforcement?”

“I agree about parking enforcement at the zebra and the same applies to the cars exiting from Fulwell Road against the one-way. Identification from a temporary CCTV camera resulting in a fine/licence points would be a big deterrent.”

“Talking of enforcement there's a good picture on [Google Street View](#) of a car not parked in the zigzags but on double yellow lines AND the pavement.”

### **4.2 Road Surface**

“I've cycled up there a few times and Stanley Road is generally a bit rubbish with parked cars, bus route, bad surface so I would normally avoid it altogether.”

### **4.3 Advanced Stop Lines and Cycle Lanes**

“As works are being carried out here could a few pence worth of white paint be spared for the creation of an Advanced Stop Line at the southbound approach to the Shacklegate Lane crossroads? A lead in lane already exists.”

“An ASL on Stanley Road southbound and renovation of the existing cycle lane.”

“The cycle lane feeding the signals ASL on Stanley Road northbound has been curtailed to make way for car parking. The result is that cycles approaching the cycle lane, through the bus stop, have to move out into the stream of traffic to get into the cycle lane as they approach the signals, which increases the risk. We should ask for the cycle lane to be restored to its previous length. Incidentally, this car parking also hinders buses leaving the stop.”