

Annex 3 – Consultation responses

Consultee	Comment	Officer response
Kennington Parish Council	<p>Thank you for allowing Kennington Parish Council to comment on this proposal. The members of the Parish Council discussed it at their meeting last night and agreed that it was a good idea to have shared use cycle and pedestrian paths on both sides of the carriageway. It is hoped that the signage and access on and off the path for cyclists will be carefully designed to encourage cyclists to use this path safely. There was concern that if they continued to use the narrower carriageway it would cause more conflicts with vehicles.</p>	<p>The details regarding access on and off the path have been resolved and sent to Network rail for construction.</p>
CTC	<p>Thanks for providing such detailed drawings, and an explanation of the construction constraints.</p> <p>The bridge and embankment constraints make a normal design (recommended widths etc) pretty much impossible to achieve. Sometimes the choice is to provide a not to standard design, or to leave things as they are - this might be tricky as section A-A in drawing 5 suggests you cannot reduce the southern footway due to the number of services under that footway, and the bridge deck is too thin to put the services under the roadway. In any event, the existing provision during the morning commute period is not satisfactory due to the cycle lane width (as narrow as 0.7m when I measured it some years ago) and encroaching vehicles..</p> <p>As I understand the drawings, the 2m is from kerb to barrier, which in effect makes it 1.75m width (knock off 0.25m when adjacent to a vertical surface). Lamp stands are behind fences/barriers, so are not an issue.</p> <p><i>The summary of my thoughts set out below are :-</i></p>	<p>The design details have been amended as suggested and sent to Network Rail for construction.</p> <p>Removal of centre line is not recommended on a road partly governed by a national speed limit. The carriageway has been narrowed to the minimum for a bus route which should help to slow vehicle speeds</p>

1. *To provide a shared cycle pedestrian track as you intend, you need to sort out the entrances/exit design for the cyclists. Providing a facility with poorly designed/sub standard entry/exit points is not acceptable.*
2. *If you are unable to provide to standard/good practice entry/exit points, then don't provide shared use foot/cycle tracks. If this is the case, provide something that is basically the same as now, as wide as possible Oxford bound advisory cycle lane on the road. Oxford bound traffic is the side that queues and obstructs cyclists, hence the need for an advisory cycle lane. There is not the same need Abingdon bound - a nice to have, but no room available due to embankment constraints etc.*

Issues are :-

- Flush vs lowered kerbs.
- East bound (north side) shared use track.
- West bound (south side) shared use track.

Flush kerbs.

All design guidelines for cycle tracks insist on **flush kerbs**, not lowered kerbs. Even a lowered kerb, taken at a shallow angle (as these will, due to the constrained road width) can be pretty dangerous when your front wheel takes a wobble..... For more information, see the link.

http://www.dft.gov.uk/cyclingengland/site/wp-content/uploads/2008/10/b06_flush_kerbs.pdf

Pooling of water is not an issue if everything is constructed correctly. In this case, all but one flush kerbs will be on a 6% or so slope, so any water will simply drain down the hill.

East bound (north side) track.

Cycles coming from Hinksey roundabout will be at some speed, so the length of flush kerb section needs to be 2m, which when viewed (ridden) at a shallow angle will appear much less than that.

Dairy Crest entrance. Articulated trucks use this, articulated trucks are the biggest killer of cyclists in London (when they turn corners). Crossing the Dairy entrance, the shared track should :-

- Be highlighted in green and/or white line on each side of the track.
- Have a cycle symbol painted on it.
- Have flush kerbs on each side of the entrance.
- Be level across the entrance (make it a raised entry treatment if needed).
- Have right of way across the turning, thus giveaway lines marked at the back of the shared use track.

From your drawings, it is unclear where the cyclists are meant to rejoin the bus lane (the * in the drawing suggests joining before the bus lane). Where cyclists rejoin the bus lane, they should be protected by a kerb build out - the bus lane is about the only one in the county wide enough for this to be a possibility. Cyclists must be able to join the bus lane where there is room for both, not where the bus is still squeezing past the last few cars to get into the bus lane. By my reckoning on Google street view, the cycles need to join somewhere between the church vehicle entrance and Go Out Doors vehicle entrance. A cycle symbol on the road will

	<p>hopefully help remind vehicles turning into these 2 entrances that cyclists might be present.</p> <p>West bound (south side) track.</p> <p>This has more serious issues at each end. When I drive out of the recycling centre, due to poor visibility (bridge wall and fence) I need to be right out at the kerb line to see what is coming from the Oxford direction. This is in direct conflict with the location (* on the drawing) proposed for the flush kerb/cycle entry. If visibility was better, the vehicle give way line could be moved back, but this is not possible here. Thus, the flush kerb entry point would need to be after the recycling centre exit, aprox 20m further west from your proposed location.</p> <p>The proposed exit flush kerb location. Quite a few cyclists after crossing the railway bridge go straight on at the bottom, to join the cycle track up to Hinksey roundabout. Your proposed flush kerb location is completely impractical for someone going straight on. A flush kerb 50 - 100 m (near the Hinksey stream bridge?) with protective kerb build out needs to be provided to allow straight on cyclists to merge with the road before the Kennington turning.</p> <p>For cyclists travelling to Kennington, a protective kerb build out needs to be provided. The merge point needs to be further round the corner. As cyclists will need to look completely backwards to see what is coming, cutting the corner off (along side the existing fence) would enable cyclists to approach the merge point with a better angle of view.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>At the end of each shared use track.</p> <p>There is an issue of inappropriate cycling on footways, rather blurred by the number of cycle tracks put on footways. At the end of each shared use track, there should be painted on the footway, "No Cycling".</p> <p>White lines.</p> <p>As the roadway is of limited width, I would suggest no centre line. It makes drivers more cautious, and so slower.</p>	
Cyclox	<p>For the avoidance of doubt, any shared cycle footpath on the South side would demand significant change to the multiple entries to Park & Ride, the Waste Station and possibly more. The brick bridge over a Hinksey Stream branch is a restraint on continuity of available widths. If funds do not enable a high quality off-road scheme the on road position should stay.</p> <p>The North side is more amenable to a hybrid lane or shared path. A significantly widened path would be possible especially with an asymmetric design.. The yellow lining in the existing cycle lane makes it look like a risible provision, either a shared or hybrid would move these yellow lines away from the cyclists' provision, additionally it would create a visually narrower carriageway for motorists and potentially a reduced speed.</p> <p>As James Dawton says the detail of a design is paramount in ensuring a provision for cyclists is used as a cyclists' provision. Could I suggest that drawings of details need to be at 1:200 to enable accurate dimensioning, including lampposts and signs and allowing for vegetation?</p> <p>The existence of any deviations from a level surface (with drainage falls)</p>	<p>The shared path starts after the P&R and recycling centre so no need to alter the accesses.</p> <p>The pavements are being widened and carriageway restricted as much as possible but given the low pedestrian footfall and the provision in both directions, the widths are deemed appropriate.</p>

CMDT9

	<p>must be drawn for understanding and comment.</p> <p>Entering any shared footway needs to be well designed. Coming from the A34 Hinksey Hill roundabout it is quite possible to be travelling at over 20mph as the entry to any proposed shared path is reached. I attach a number of protected entry/exit images.</p>	<p>The design has been amended to take into account comments</p>
<p>Cllr John Tanner</p>	<p>Thanks for your e-mail. I apologise for my delay in replying.</p> <p>I am against shared use of pavements by cyclists and pedestrians especially in the city. It sends out mixed messages and sadly encourages cyclists to use pavements where they are not meant to.</p> <p>I think I support the Network Rail idea of a wider carriageway. It seems odd to me that bridges are allowed to be rebuilt at a sub-standard width. Discouraging cyclists from using the main carriageway will tend to invite motorists to drive faster.</p> <p>I would like an approach which gives priority to pedestrians and then cyclists but separately. If the carriageway is then too narrow it could then be controlled by traffic lights. This would also be an advantage in preventing collisions on a humped back bridge.</p> <p>There is a good cycle route parallel to Abingdon Road which starts at Bertie Place and has road crossing links on the Old Abingdon Road and Abingdon Road. It would be good to have a cycle and pedestrian route linking the South Oxford cycle route with Kennington.</p> <p>We will not encourage more pedestrians and cyclists if we keep giving priority to motorised traffic.</p>	<p>The location of the proposed measures and the low pedestrian footfall should be taken into account when deciding shared pavements. A city centre location where footfall is high is not desirable but in a location that forms a link between settlements it can be a very good and cost-effective measure for increasing cycling, especially given the proximity of Kennington and Radley to Oxford.</p> <p>Measures have been introduced to sign and encourage cyclists back on to the carriageway.</p> <p>The South Oxford Cycle Route is not popular with cyclists due to the indirect route, use of</p>

CMDT9

	<p>I remain opposed to any cycling on pavements. However otherwise this is a good scheme.</p>	<p>subway and lack of 'natural surveillance.</p> <p>The route is providing more priority to cyclists and less to motor traffic by widening the paths and narrowing the carriageway</p>
<p>Cllr Arash Fatemian</p>	<p>Thanks for sending these through. Very interesting and looking forward to the cycling provision on the new bridge. Happy for this to go to delegated decisions.</p>	<p>Noted</p>