

1. Problems Stated by Highway Authority at Identified Location

“The Council will be undertaking essential road safety improvements on Hampton Court Road Roundabout. The scheme is funded by Transport for London, and is expected to benefit the local area by reducing Personal Injury Collisions and improving pedestrian / cyclist accessibility.”

[Consultation Letter](#)

[Hampton Court Road Roundabout Consultation Area](#)

2. Solutions Proposed by Highway Authority

1. *“Realignment of zebra crossings on the roundabout;*
2. *Widening existing pedestrian refuges;*
3. *Removing visual blockage created by existing planter on the roundabout;*
4. *Extending the existing cycle facilities joining them to the new Toucan Crossing;*
5. *Renew the footway on the west side of Hampton Court Bridge.”*

“The improvements will create a safer crossing environment at the roundabout by increasing inter-visibility between pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. The Council will also take the opportunity to improve the street scene with the removal of any unnecessary signage and street furniture where possible.”

[Hampton Court Roundabout Design Plan](#)

3. RCC Responses to the Proposed Solutions

“Can we ask the Council if this is the same as the 2 schemes listed in the [Draft Cycling Capital Budget 2011-12](#) that are TfL funded?”

- **Scheme 3 Borough Cycle Network, Implementation of cycle improvements on the Borough’s cycle network**

Hampton Court Bridge – in partnership with Surrey County Council the design and approval of off-road cycle route improvements across bridge and upgrading of existing Pelican crossing to Toucan as part of TfL Signals Modernisation Programme, and

- **Scheme 4 Greenways, Implementation of improvements on the Borough’s Greenways network**

Hampton Court Roundabout – contribution to off-road cycling routes and crossings on all arms of roundabout to provide improved routes to National Cycle Network and routes to / from Surrey

3.1 Are the proposals a solution to the stated problems?

“The Council have identified two separate problems at this location: 1. *“Reducing Personal Injury Collisions”* and 2. *“Improving pedestrian / cyclist accessibility”* so we should distinguish between them when we respond.”

3.1.1 Reducing Personal Injury Collisions

“The [map](#) on [ITO World](#) shows a cluster on the [north-east approach to the roundabout](#) [from Kingston] which can be extended to include the exit lanes on the opposite carriageway [towards Kingston]. This is in the vicinity of the existing zebra crossing from Hampton Court Palace to Hampton Court Green so the 1st proposal, *“Realignment of zebra crossings on the roundabout”*, may be a solution to the problem if its current site has been identified as a contributory cause of collisions.”

1.1 Reducing Personal Injury Collisions, cont.

“The other clusters are on the [south-west approach](#) [towards Kingston] where there is no zebra so the realignment proposal doesn't apply. Presumably “*Removing visual blockage created by existing planter on the roundabout*” is the proposed solution here because poor vision has been identified as a contributing cause of collisions. The cluster on the [westbound exit](#) [towards Hampton] is in the vicinity of an existing zebra crossing but there's no proposal to relocate it so presumably its current site is not considered to be a contributory cause of collisions here.”

“The TfL map of cyclist collisions, for the 5 years 2006 to 2010, shows 3 slight collisions at this roundabout. Looking at the bigger picture of the route to Kingston there are 5 at the other end of Hampton Court Road, around Hampton Wick and Church Grove, 2 of which were serious. There are also 3 serious collisions along the length of Hampton Court Road with two slight collisions at the junction with Chestnut Avenue.”

“I'm concerned about the “*Proposed coach drop-off point*” forcing people who cycle to move into an outer lane in order to pass.”

3.1.2 Improving pedestrian / cyclist accessibility

“It's hard to look at it and think ‘*cycle friendly facility*’. Maybe we should find some ten year olds to own one of the three lanes when going straight across.”

3.1.2a “*Extending existing cycle facilities joining them to the new Toucan Crossing*”

“How does this fit with the [planning application](#) from the Palace to make changes to the [existing arrangements](#) at [Trophy Gate](#)?”

“At the same time as replacing the pelican with a toucan why not move the crossing a bit further south, close to the junction with Barge Walk? [Click [here](#) to see the proposal] The pavement on this side of the bridge can be heavily used by pedestrians and there's a bus stop between Barge Walk and the current crossing, both of which create the potential for conflict between cyclists and pedestrians.”



“It's good the pelican is being replaced by a toucan by the Palace on NCN4 but why not replace the two zebras in this scheme with toucans? Is it because of TfL's “no net gain of traffic signals” as part of their policy for smoothing traffic flow?”

Richmond Cycling Campaign Response to Planned Highway Engineering Works

3.1.2a “Extending existing cycle facilities joining them to the new Toucan Crossing”

“I thought the crossing west of the roundabout was going to be a toucan as well, to make the link with the footway route towards (but not getting to) Hampton? If not that footway looks a bit pointless. Are the Council using the [new DfT guidance \[5.40\]](#) permitting trials for cyclists to use zebra crossings where they form part of continuous cycle routes and facilities only, unlike the current pedestrian crossings regulations?”

“There are no dimensions on the plan so will the widened pedestrian refuge on the western arm zebra be wide enough for a bike or a bike and trailer? What about the north zebra?”

3.1.2b “Renew the footway on the west side of Hampton Court Bridge”



“Work on the segregated path is welcome: how about the same as Kingston Bridge?”



4. RCC Proposed Additional Works at the Identified Locations

4.1 Reducing Personal Injury Collisions

“There are no proposals at all to make it safer for people who cycle on the road. There are no cycle lanes, mandatory or advisory, and no proposal to limit motor vehicle speed in an attempt to rebalance the relationship. I don't mind being actively discouraged from using the road if there's an alternative provided but there isn't one between Bushy Park, the roundabout, the bridge and the railway station.”

4.2 Improving pedestrian / cyclist accessibility

4.2.1 How it could be

“This scheme is a good example of a site where cycling facilities need improving; this can be done at low cost but it has been overlooked, or ignored.”

“This is a real missed opportunity to create a hub for cycle journeys north, south, east, and west, some of which exist already but which just aren't joined up. For example, if you're cycling from Kingston what help is given to cross the carriageway to get to the cycle path that's been built across the Green and avoids the roundabout altogether for east-west journeys? This is supposed to be London Cycle Network Route 167 but it abandons the cyclist when it gets difficult.”



“This is a very narrowly drawn scheme, unless they're building blocks for a grand design we've not been told about. The cycling element is not much more than the segregated path over the bridge for people cycling east-west on NCN4.”

“It's depressing anyone thinks a 3 lane roundabout is necessary in front of Hampton Court Palace: click [here](#) for how it could look like.”

4.2.2 The North-South axis

“The Council needs to acknowledge the number of people who cycle north south, particularly at the beginning and end of the working day during the working week. Apart from the unsurprising number of people cycling towards London we know people commute out of Teddington to work in Thames Ditton and Esher: and what about all the students going to Esher College? National Cycle Network 4 is primarily a leisure route running east west, a roundabout route with a poor quality surface, and welcome though the proposed work to renew the segregated path over the bridge is it should be seen in this context.”

Richmond Cycling Campaign Response to Planned Highway Engineering Works

“At the very least the existing segregated path over the bridge should be extended to the roundabout and left to the zebra crossing to join up with the off-road lanes on the north side of Hampton Court Road.”

“There’s a requirement for a safe route from Bushy Park to Hampton Court Station which avoids riding the roundabout. This is potentially available since there is a 3m wide footway from the zebra crossing by Bushy Park gates all the way to the station. (There are some obstructions in places but these could be coped with.) It is used informally by cyclists but it needs to be made into a shared-use footway. This would make a substantial improvement to cycling facilities at this site.”

“A shared use path, using what’s already there, should run beside Hampton Court Palace from the Lion Gate at Bushy Park



and over the bridge to join up with cycle path outside Hampton Court Station.”

