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Executive summary

Between 28 September and 19 November 2017 we consulted on proposals for Cycle Superhighway Route 4 (CS4) from Tower Bridge to Greenwich. The consultation asked for feedback on the proposals from residents, businesses, employers, transport users and other relevant stakeholders. We publicised the consultation using leaflets distributed across a wide area, targeted email campaigns and via news stories in regional and local media.

This document explains the processes of the consultation, and provides a summary of responses we received.

We received 3,265 direct responses to our consultation, of which 83 per cent supported or strongly supported our proposals. 14 per cent opposed or strongly opposed them, while 3 per cent neither supported nor opposed the proposals.

Many of the responses provided detailed feedback, which we are continuing to analyse to ensure we have understood the full range of issues raised on the scheme. We aim to publish a detailed response to the issues raised and our next steps, later in 2018.

Summary of issues raised during consultation

Below is a summary of some of the more prominent issues raised during the consultation. Our detailed analysis of responses is included as Appendix A.

- Support for CS4 as it will be safer for cyclists than the current road layout
- Comments suggesting that we ensure CS4 comes to Lower Road
- Support for segregated cycle tracks on CS4
- Concern that CS4 will worsen the existing congestion on the route
- Concern expressed that the existing layout is dangerous for cycling
- Support for CS4 as it will generally increase cycling in the area, e.g. for shopping, leisure, commuting
- Comments suggesting CS4 is extended to Woolwich
- Concern that CS4 will worsen the existing pollution on the route due to increased congestion
- Support from cyclists who currently use the route and feel that CS4 would benefit their journey
- Support for CS4 as it will help reduce air / noise pollution and / or provide other environmental benefits

Responses from stakeholders

We received 52 responses from stakeholders, including politicians, statutory bodies, employers, trade organisations, residents’ associations, developers, campaign groups, disability groups, sporting and leisure amenities and more. We have summarised the issues raised by these stakeholders in Section 4.13.
Petitions and campaigns

No petitions were submitted to the consultation. We identified six campaigns, where identical or very similar texts were submitted to the consultation. Where the group responsible for these responses is known, we have included this information in our summary in Section 4.14. The following two campaigns generated over 50 responses each:

- 1,350 London Cycling Campaign submissions supported CS4. They suggested several areas where the plans could be improved and for the scheme to be extended. They also requested the Lower Road section be consulted on as soon as possible.

- 80 Sustrans submissions supported CS4. They welcomed the proposals for a segregated cycling facility as well as the improvements for pedestrians. They also called for Lower Road to be consulted on and the extension of the route.

Conclusion and next steps

We are currently reviewing the proposals in light of the consultation responses in order to determine the best way forward. All issues raised will be considered and we will continue to discuss the scheme with key stakeholders. We plan to publish a detailed response to the issues raised during consultation, as well as our next steps, later in 2018.
1. About the proposals

1.1 Introduction

We worked closely with key stakeholders to develop proposals for a major new cycle route in south-east London. Cycle Superhighway 4 (CS4) would provide a direct and continuous, segregated cycle route between Tower Bridge and Greenwich, along with new and upgraded pedestrian crossings, improved public spaces and a host of other improvements aimed at creating a more attractive environment for all users and accommodating the area’s future growth. This consultation did not include proposals for Lower Road, which will be consulted on at a later date.

CS4 would form part of London’s expanding network of Cycle Superhighways, an important part of the Mayor’s Transport Strategy and Healthy Streets Approach, which aim to encourage walking, cycling and public transport, making London greener, healthier and more pleasant.

1.2 Purpose

Around 3,500 trips are already being made daily by people cycling along the A200. In addition, this route has among the highest numbers of pedestrian journeys in London. CS4 is designed to help us meet the target set out in the Mayor’s Transport Strategy of changing the way people choose to travel so that, by 2041, 80 per cent of all trips in London are made by walking, cycling or public transport, up from 64 per cent today.

1.2.1 Improving safety

Safety is one of the main barriers to cycling in London. Between September 2013 and August 2016, there were 93 recorded collisions involving cyclists and 49 recorded collisions involving pedestrians along this section of the A200. Our research shows that if the route were safer, more journeys could be made on foot or by cycle.

CS4 would separate cyclists from motor traffic by providing kerbed cycle tracks along its length. At major junctions, cycles would be separated from motor traffic using cycling-specific traffic light phases to reduce the risk of collisions. Our proposals also include major safety improvements at Rotherhithe Roundabout, which was identified as a priority for changes as part of our Safer Junctions programme.

1.2.2 Active travel in south-east London

Cycling is now a major mode of transport in London. There are more than 670,000 cycle trips a day in the capital, an increase of over 130 per cent since 2000. The introduction of the East-West and North-South Cycle Superhighways has seen a significant increase in cycling as a mode of transport along those routes.
An emerging network of Cycle Superhighways exists in north, south and east London, but none yet in south-east London. Our proposals would bring a high-quality cycle facility to south-east London, encouraging more people to start cycling. Our analysis shows that sections of Tooley Street and Jamaica Road are among the top one per cent of areas for cycle demand in London, while the entire CS4 route is in the top five per cent.

Improving facilities for cycling and walking along the proposed CS4 route would not only benefit those who currently walk and cycle, but could also have a positive effect on public health by increasing the levels of physical activity in the area. Our research shows that sections of the proposed route are in the top one per cent of London’s road network for its potential to switch from vehicles to cycling as a means of transport. The majority of the route is in the top five per cent. There is also great potential to encourage people to switch from making short vehicle trips to walking.

These proposals form part of the Mayor of London’s plan for Healthy Streets. This is a long-term vision to encourage more Londoners to walk and cycle by making London’s streets healthier, safer and more welcoming. Currently, only 34 per cent of Londoners take the recommended 20 minutes of physical activity on any given day. The new cycle facilities and pedestrian improvements are designed to help encourage more people to use active and sustainable modes of transport.

1.2.3 Improving places

Our proposals would help connect Bermondsey, Rotherhithe, Deptford and Greenwich, linking important amenities and facilities, and making them more pleasant places to live, work, shop and spend time. We would install new seating areas and cycle parking to provide space for people to rest and spend time in these town centres, along with other improvements such as new plants and trees. Our proposals aim to create more welcoming and inclusive streets for individuals and communities to enjoy.

1.2.4 Improvements to accommodate growth

London is growing and changing, with the city’s population forecast to rise from 9 million people today to 10.5 million in 2041. We must find new ways to plan London’s growth, including proposals like CS4 to encourage healthy and sustainable transport. CS4 is part of a package of planned and proposed improvements aimed at helping this part of south-east London accommodate expected growth, including the regeneration of Canada Water, recent improvements made to ease congestion at Rotherhithe Roundabout, and the proposed Rotherhithe to Canary Wharf river crossing.
1.3 Detailed description

We published detailed proposals on our website at tfl.gov.uk/cs4. There, we provided an overview of the scheme, along with maps and computer-generated images showing how the roads would look after CS4 was implemented.

Due to the length of the scheme, we divided the route up into 10 sections, each with their own explanations and maps. Our survey asked for feedback on the overall scheme, and on each section (apart from Section 5: Lower Road, which will be consulted on at a later date).

We have reproduced the website’s summary of our proposals below. The full consultation materials (including section summaries, traffic impacts, maps and images) will remain available at tfl.gov.uk/cs4

Where would CS4 go?

The proposed route would run along Tooley Street, Jamaica Road, Evelyn Street and Creek Road, linking Bermondsey, Rotherhithe, Deptford and Greenwich.

Lower Road

This consultation does not include proposals for Lower Road, which will be consulted on at a later date. Lower Road is adjacent to Canada Water, an area that will see major regeneration and development in the next few years. To understand how these developments and future transport schemes would affect the existing road network, we have jointly commissioned a Strategic Transport Study with the London Borough of Southwark. When completed, this study will inform the design for Lower Road, ensuring that it meets the future needs of the community.

What is proposed for CS4?

Improvements for cycling

- New two-way segregated cycle track on the north side of Tooley Street, Jamaica Road, Evelyn Street and Creek Road replaces some bus and general traffic lanes
- Cycle track switches to the south side at the junction with Southwark Park Road to bypass Rotherhithe Roundabout
- Proposals for the Lower Road section to be consulted on at a later date
- Cyclists bypass traffic light controlled junctions at Abbey Street and Deptford Church Street
- Cyclists are separately controlled by signals at all other junctions
• Connection to proposed cycling Quietway 14 at Tanner Street (find out more about Tanner Street)

Road design and layout
• Some general traffic lane replaced by new two-way segregated cycle track
• Redesigned and improved geometry of Rotherhithe Roundabout to encourage better lane discipline and assist all through movements
• Left turn lane on Jamaica Road extended to reduce queueing time for buses and local traffic trying to access Brunel Road
• Removal of some central reservation on Jamaica Road to accommodate new cycling facilities
• Mini-roundabout replaces signalised junction at Oxestalls Road
• Removal of centre line markings on some sections of Evelyn Street to improve road safety
• Making Shad Thames one-way northbound to improve the performance of the junction and reduce pedestrian wait times
• Banning the left turn from Jamaica Road into Bevington Street to provide a continuous eastbound bus lane and improve bus journeys
• Making Cathy Street one-way northbound to remove through-traffic from residential roads, while allowing a new right turn into Cathay Street from Jamaica Road to improve local access
• Making Marigold Street exit-only on to Jamaica Road to improve safety for all road users
• Banning the right turn into Evelyn Street from Watergate Street and Deptford High Street, and banning the right turn into Deptford High Street from Evelyn Street

Change to buses
• Some bus lane replaced by new two-way segregated cycle track on Jamaica Road, Evelyn Street and Creek Road
• New eastbound bus gate on the Jamaica Road approach to Rotherhithe Roundabout to prioritise bus access to Lower Road
• Changes to bus stop locations along Evelyn Street
• Changes to some bus stop layouts, including new bus stop bypasses for cyclists (find out more about bus stop bypasses)

Improvements for walking
• Five new signal-controlled pedestrian crossings, including three along Jamaica Road
• Upgrades to existing pedestrian crossings including simpler 8-metre wide crossing outside Bermondsey Station
• 6-metre wide toucan crossing (for pedestrians and cyclists) outside Deptford Park Primary school
• 6-metre wide pedestrian crossing on desire line opposite Deptford High Street
• Pedestrian crossing on the eastern arm of the Norway Street / Creek Road junction moved to the western arm and widened to 6 metres.
• Pedestrian crossing time saving of over 1 minute expected outside Bermondsey Station and at the Jamaica Road junction with Tanner Street

**Predicted impacts**

We are proposing major changes to the road layout to make cycling and walking easier, safer and more appealing. We have considered all road users throughout the design process so as not to have a disproportionate impact on any one group. This section summarises the impacts we predict our proposals to have on different road users.

**General traffic and bus journey times**

The reallocation of road space is expected to change some journey times and traffic movements. We have carried out traffic modelling to predict how the proposals might affect journey times and traffic movement through the area affected by the scheme. A summary of this analysis is available below:

We would actively monitor and manage traffic conditions following delivery of the scheme. We are investing in advanced traffic signal technology to allow us to better manage traffic depending on differing conditions at any given time, and we are working to improve road user information so people can make informed journey choices before they travel.

**Parking and loading**

Our proposals for CS4 include changes to the layouts of some of the parking and loading bays along the route. Double yellow lines (no parking at any time) would also replace single yellow lines along some sections of Evelyn Street and Creek Road.

During the consultation period, we contacted premises we think could be affected by these changes. If you think the proposals could affect you or your business, please contact us to let us know (contact details are at the bottom of this page). We encourage you to discuss these proposals with your suppliers.

**Environment**

Our proposals aim to improve the quality of life in the area by:
• Reducing the dominance of motor traffic, allowing people to better enjoy the area
• Improving pedestrian crossings and cycle facilities, to encourage more people to walk and cycle through the area
• Protecting bus journey times to safeguard public transport as a mode of choice

Although not a traffic-generating scheme, our proposals would change how traffic moves around the area, which may result in some associated and localised changes in air quality and noise levels. Environmental surveys and modelling would take place as part of our ongoing evaluation of these proposals.

Air pollution is one of the most significant challenges facing London, affecting the health of all Londoners. As part of the plans for new measures to tackle London’s current poor air quality, we are consulting on proposals to bring forward the introduction of the London Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ).

A number of other schemes to improve London’s air quality are planned, including taking steps to reduce air pollution from our bus fleet, reducing emissions from taxis and private hire vehicles, setting up five Low Emission Neighbourhoods, and expanding the electric vehicle charging network and making it simpler to use.

We are investing to make London’s streets healthy, safe and attractive places to walk and cycle. Enabling more journeys to be made on foot or by bike can help reduce private vehicle use and associated emissions. Read more about how we are creating Healthy Streets.

Equalities

How we fulfil our obligations under the Equality Act 2010

We are subject to the general public sector equality duty set out in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which requires us to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations by reference to people with protected characteristics. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. As part of our decision-making process on the proposals for Cycle Superhighways, we have had due regard to any impacts on those with protected characteristics and the need to ensure that their interests are taken into account.

In considering the design of our streets, we closely consider the needs of all users throughout the design process. On significant infrastructure projects, such as Cycle Superhighways, we:
• Complete Equality Impact Assessments (EQIAs) at the outset of the project, to review potential impacts on equality target groups, including disabled people

• Carry out public consultations, including targeted engagement with specific users such as (among many others): Royal National Institute of Blind People, Guide Dogs, Age UK, Transport for All, and National Autistic Society

• Ensure we comply with established guidance – such as the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges – which includes detailed requirements for disabled people

The EQIA completed for CS4 shows positive impacts for black and ethnic minority groups, females, disabled cyclists, and cyclists under 25 and over 65 years of age. Positive impacts have also been identified for disabled pedestrians, as the scheme involves a number of improvements to pedestrian facilities, including wider footways and new and improved crossings. Some negative impacts have been identified where footways are cut back or shared-use footway is introduced. However, the minimum 2-metre standard for footway widths has been maintained to allow two wheelchair users to pass safely. Kerb-protected cycle facilities, which lead to positive impacts for people with protected characteristics when they are cycling, work most effectively when they feature bus stop bypasses. Bus stop bypasses and their impacts are described below.

Bus stop bypasses

At bus stop bypasses, the cycle track continues behind the bus stop at carriageway level, providing continuous segregation from motor traffic for people cycling. Bus passengers access a waiting area by crossing the cycle track using a raised, marked crossing point. The waiting area would be at least 2.5 metres wide. Pedestrians would cross the cycle track at raised, marked crossing points to continue their journey.

Our research has found that bus stop bypasses are safe for all road users, including bus passengers. Routing cycle traffic away from the road is an effective way to create safe, attractive cycling facilities along bus routes. The risk of conflict between cycles and pedestrians has been found to be very low, while providing a dedicated crossing point for bus passengers and design features that encourage slower cycling help to make the bus stop area more comfortable for everyone to use.

Bus stop bypasses are used across Europe and there are a number of examples in operation or planned across the UK, including in Brighton, Cambridge and Manchester, as well as in London. We introduced some bus stop bypasses on the Cycle Superhighway 2 (CS2) extension between Bow and Stratford in Autumn 2013 and across other Cycle Superhighways in 2015-16.
We are continuing to engage with accessibility and cycling groups and carry out additional research into the type and layout of pedestrian crossings at bus stop bypasses. We have a dedicated working group overseeing on-street trialling of the use of zebra crossings over cycle tracks at bus stop bypasses. This group includes representatives from Transport for All, the Royal National Institute of Blind People, Guide Dogs, Age UK London, London TravelWatch, Cycling Embassy of Great Britain, Living Streets, the London Cycling Campaign and Cycling UK. We will incorporate findings of these further investigations, including the outcomes of discussions about the trial with the working group, into final proposals for CS4.

**Tactile paving**

We would use tactile paving on all crossings and traffic islands throughout CS4. Along the route, tactile paving would be designed according to Department for Transport guidance. Local standards would apply in the London Borough of Lewisham and the Royal Borough of Greenwich.

**Accessibility for cyclists with disabilities**

CS4 would be suitable for use by disabled cyclists using adapted cycles, such as hand cycles and tricycles. The designs adhere to the principles for inclusive cycling set out in our London Cycling Design Standards. Cycle tracks on CS4 would be as wide as possible and a smooth riding surface would be provided, with the entire cycle route to be resurfaced.
2. About the consultation

2.1 Purpose

The objectives of the consultation are:

- To give stakeholders and the public easily-understandable information about the proposals and allow them to respond
- To understand the level of support for or opposition to the proposals
- To understand any issues that might affect the proposal which we were not previously aware of
- To understand concerns and objections
- To allow respondents to make suggestions

2.2 Potential outcomes

The potential outcomes of this and any other consultation are:

- Following careful consideration of the consultation responses, we decide to proceed with the scheme as set out in the consultation
- Following careful consideration of the consultation responses, we modify the scheme in response to issues raised during the consultation and proceed with a revised scheme
- Following careful consideration of the consultation responses, we decide not to proceed with the scheme

2.3 Who we consulted

We ensured that people living and working in areas affected by the scheme were aware of the proposals by sending large volumes of notification letters and emails.

By posting information about the CS4 consultation directly to properties up to a distance of 500 metres from the proposed route, we raised awareness of our consultation among residents, residents’ associations, retailers, businesses, business groups, charities, leisure and sports clubs, educational establishments, healthcare providers, religious communities, public amenities, and other organisations with premises in this area.

We targeted email information at individuals on our customer database who we know use the route or live nearby (because they had previously supplied their postcode to us via Oyster, Congestion Charging, Cycle Hire, or for another reason). In this way, we raised awareness of the consultation among people who drive, cycle, use buses and other public transport.
We sent emails to stakeholders who had been identified as interested in this scheme. Our contact list included disability groups, organisations representing the elderly, transport user groups, businesses and major employers, trade organisations, statutory organisations, charities, local government, politicians, residents’ representatives, healthcare providers, leisure and sports clubs, educational establishments, religious communities, and others.

We distributed postcards publicising the consultation at Blue Anchor, Canada Water, Deptford Lounge and West Greenwich libraries as well as local community centres on the route across Southwark, Lewisham and Greenwich boroughs. Reference manuals showing details of our proposals were also left at these libraries so that residents could look at these in their own time.

We also provided information about the proposals and consultation to local and regional media.

For a full list of the publicity channels used, see Section 2.8.

2.5 Dates and duration

The consultation was held from 28 September to 19 November 2017, an eight-week consultation period.

2.6 Consultation survey

The area covered by the proposals was relatively large, so we divided the route into 10 sections to make it easier for people to digest the information and give feedback on areas of particular interest to them. We did not invite comment on Section 5, Lower Road, which will be consulted on at a later date.

Our survey included a closed question asking people to select an answer that matched their level of support or opposition to the overall scheme and each of its route sections. Of all the questions in the survey, only the closed question on the overall scheme was mandatory.

We also gave respondents the chance to provide comments on the overall scheme and each section (apart from Section 5, Lower Road).

For the complete list of questions we asked about CS4, see Appendix C.

2.7 Methods of responding

Individuals and stakeholders were able to respond to the consultation through the following channels:

- By answering the questions in the survey on our consultation website at tfl.gov.uk/cs4
- By sending a letter to FREEPOST TfL CONSULTATIONS
• By emailing: consultations@tfl.gov.uk. The Consultation Team also answered questions from members of the public and stakeholders via email.
• By phoning our Customer Service Team, who were available to answer questions and take responses from members of the public. When our telephone operatives were unable to answer questions immediately, these were forwarded to the Consultation Team, and were answered subsequently by email or telephone.
• By leaving comments and/or filling in a survey at one of the public drop-in sessions (or posting a survey to the address above).
• Through our Customer Services Team, it was possible to request foreign language translations, large print, Braille or audio versions of our consultation materials.

2.8 Consultation materials and publicity
We used a range of channels to raise awareness of the CS4 consultation, ensuring the public and stakeholders were aware of the consultation and its purposes.

We explain the channels used below. All materials encouraged interested parties to visit our website or contact us to find out more about the scheme and to respond.

2.8.1 Website
Our website provided detailed information about our consultation, including text explanations of our proposals, maps and computer-generated images helping to explain the proposals. The website was divided into pages showing an overview of the scheme, pages explaining the separate sections of the route, and pages containing in-depth information about motor traffic impacts, pedestrian impacts and bus impacts. We also included information about environmental impacts and equalities, including a specific page explaining bus stop bypasses.

The website provided people with the opportunity to respond to the consultation by answering our questionnaire.

2.8.2 Letters
We produced three notification letters, each tailored to audiences in the London Boroughs of Lewisham, Southwark or the Royal Borough of Greenwich. The letters summarised the overall proposals, included an annotated map showing the whole route, and included details relevant to audiences in each borough such as a summary of interventions in the area and details of drop-in events in the borough. All letters encouraged recipients to find more information about the scheme online or by contacting us, and to respond to the consultation via our survey.

Letters were distributed to 34,126 addresses in the London Borough of Southwark; 11,225 addresses in the London Borough of Lewisham; and 7,543 addresses in the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
The distribution covered an area not less than 400 metres from the proposed route. The letters and maps of the distribution area can be found in Appendix D.

2.8.3 Emails to public
We sent an email about the consultation to 200,000 people who live locally or use our transport services in the area. The data for the distribution list is extracted from our master database of those who have registered their details with us – for example, through use of Congestion Charge, Oyster Card or Cycle Hire services.

2.8.4 Emails to stakeholders
We sent an email outlining the scheme and explaining where to find more information and respond to over 500 businesses and organisations identified as interested in road schemes in this area. The list of some of the stakeholders we contacted can be found in Appendix E.

2.8.5 Press and media activity
Our press team raised awareness of the CS4 consultation by contacting national, specialist, regional and local media organisations while the consultation was taking place. Examples of media coverage can be found in Appendix D. In addition, we advertised the consultation in the local press. The consultation was advertised in: Lewisham & Greenwich Mercury Series, Greenwich Weekender, Southwark News and the Southwark Weekender.

2.8.6 Public meetings, events and exhibitions

Pre-consultation engagement activities
We contacted 8 schools on or up to a distance of 400 metres from the proposed route to inform them about the upcoming consultation. We met with the Executive Business Manager of Grinling Gibbons Primary School in Lewisham.

Public drop-in events
During the formal consultation period we held seven public drop-in events across three boroughs at times and locations designed to capture a broad audience of attendees. At these events TfL staff were available to answer questions about the scheme from members of the public or stakeholders. TfL staff who attended included specialists from the project, design, consultation and modelling teams. We estimate that we spoke with around 500 individuals across all the events and received approximately 150 comments.

The events were held at the following locations and dates:

- Tuesday 3 October 3-7pm, Beormund Community Centre, 177 Abbey Street, SE1 2AN (Southwark)
- Thursday 5 October 3-7pm, Deptford Lounge 9 Giffin Street, SE8 4RH (Lewisham)
- Saturday 14 October 11am-3pm, Deptford Lounge 9 Giffin Street, SE8 4RH (Lewisham)
- Tuesday 17 October 4-7pm, St Alfege Church Hall, 3 Greenwich Church Street, SE10 9BJ (Greenwich)
- Saturday 21 October 11am-3pm, James Wolfe Primary School, 21 Randall Place, SE10 9LA (Greenwich)
- Wednesday 25 October 3pm-7pm, The Finnish Church, 33 Albion Street, SE16 7JG (Southwark)
- Saturday 4 November 11am-3pm, The Finnish Church, 33 Albion Street, SE16 7JG (Southwark)

Public meetings
TfL staff attended the following public meetings to discuss our proposals for CS4:

- 13 November 2017: Canada Water Consultative Forum
- 14 November 2017: Bermondsey & Rotherhithe Community Council

2.8.7 Meetings with stakeholders
We worked closely with the London Boroughs of Lewisham and Southwark, and the Royal Borough of Greenwich from the earliest stages of the development of the CS4 proposals. Numerous meetings between borough and TfL officers took place before the consultation as part of the collaboration on designs and on the consultation.

In addition, we took part in the following meetings and activities with stakeholders during the consultation to explain our proposals and answer questions:

- Thurs 28 September: Councillors from the London Borough of Southwark
- Wed 11 October: Representatives from the taxi and private hire trades
- Mon 23 October: Representatives from the freight industry
- Tues 24 October: Face-to-face engagement with local shops and businesses
- Thurs 26 October: Drop-in-session at Team London Bridge office
- Fri 3 November: Face-to-face engagement with local shops and businesses
- Sun 12 November: Deptford Folk community group drop-in session

Visits to businesses on the CS4 route
We visited businesses on the proposed CS4 route to deliver leaflets publicising the consultation, giving local businesses an opportunity to discuss the scheme directly with officers working on CS4 and encouraging them to respond.

We also met with various transport and road user groups including representatives from the freight industry, London TravelWatch, cycling campaign groups, pedestrian campaign groups, residents’ associations, as well as local MPs and London
Assembly Members. Some meetings took place before the consultation opened, and some during consultation.

2.8.8 Digital Advertising

We advertised the consultation digitally to mobile devices on 3/4G and Wi-Fi (home and business) within specified postcodes of the route. Users could click through from the advertisement to find out more.

2.9 How we considered equalities in the consultation

We are fully aware of our obligations under the Equality Act 2010: in particular, the effect of the public sector equality duty on our decision-making.

We included information on the impact of CS4 on protected groups on our website. This text can be found at tfl.gov.uk/cs4 and is reproduced in Section 1.3.

We took steps to ensure that all groups in the community, such as elderly, disabled or faith organisations were made aware of the proposals, their potential impacts and how to respond to the consultation. Measures taken included:

- Identifying and emailing relevant stakeholders inviting them to respond to the consultation. Organisations included, but were not limited to the British Dyslexia Association, Age UK London, Guide Dogs, Royal National Institute for the Blind, Action on Hearing Loss and Inclusion London.

- Ensuring that the materials were written in plain English, and available on request in different formats, such as Braille, large print or other languages.

- Making sure that public events were held in accessible locations and at different times of the day and that large scale materials were available to review.

- Considering how best to reach our target audiences and tailoring the way of communicating with them. For example, by preparing hard copies of our online material for those not able to access our website.
2.10 Analysis of consultation responses

We commissioned Steer Davies Gleave to analyse the consultation responses. All closed questions were reviewed and the results tabulated and reported.

All open questions, where respondents provided comments on the overall scheme or parts of it, were read and analysed in detail. Each individual comment was attributed one or more codes according to the issues raised. This information was also analysed and tabulated.

All results are reported in Chapter 3, Chapter 4 and Appendix A of this report.

Where more than one response was submitted by the same person and email address, these responses were combined before the data was analysed. Throughout the analysis process, we were mindful of our responsibilities under the Data Protection Act.
3. About the respondents

This chapter provides more information on respondents to this consultation, based on the information they provided to us in our survey. For a full list of the consultation questions, see Appendix C.

3.1 Number of respondents

Once any duplicate responses had been removed, there were 3,265 respondents. Duplicates can occur, for example, when the same person responds by email and online or when the same person responds twice online. When duplicates were identified, we combined the two responses. We processed 28 duplicates in this consultation.

Stakeholder responses are those submitted by individuals who identify themselves as representing political entities, organisations, community groups, businesses or campaign groups. Their responses are summarised in Section 4.13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public responses</td>
<td>3265</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder responses</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3317</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 How respondents heard about the consultation

We asked respondents to tell us how they heard about the consultation. A total of 2,890 (89 per cent) of 3,265 respondents provided an answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heard about the consultation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received an email from TfL</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received a letter from TfL</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read about it in the press</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw it on the TfL website</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 221 respondents who put ‘Other’, the most common answer was “London Cycling Campaign” (19 respondents).

3.3 Methods of responding

We accepted responses via our online survey; directly by email to consultations@tfl.gov.uk; and via letter or response form sent to our FREEPOST address. We also accepted feedback passed on to us through email by our
Customer Services Team, who answer phone calls from members of the public.

### 3.4 Respondent by Borough area and postcode

Of the 3,265 respondents to the consultation, 2,841 (87 per cent of all respondents) submitted their postcode. From this information, we were able to identify in which of the three boroughs on the proposed route the respondents lived. 2,098 (74 per cent of respondents who submitted their postcode) live in one the three boroughs that the route runs through. Of those that did not submit their postcode, 160 (38 per cent) identified themselves as a local resident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Borough</th>
<th>Total number of respondents</th>
<th>% of all respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode not given</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3265</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We received responses from 275 unique postcodes. Below we have listed all postcodes provided by 20 or more respondents, with percentages given as a proportion of those who answered the question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postcode</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answered postcode question</td>
<td>2841</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE16</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE8</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE10</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE1</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE3</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE13</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE15</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE14</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE18</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.1 Map showing distribution of all respondent postcodes
3.5 **Age range of respondents**

2,654 (81 per cent) out of 3,265 respondents answered the question asking for their age range. The table below shows a breakdown of these age ranges, including those who did not complete the question or indicated that they did not wish to specify their age range.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Age group</th>
<th>Total number of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-70</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71+</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Answered</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 **Respondents connection to the scheme area**

We asked respondents to describe their relationship to the scheme area using the categories below, with respondents encouraged to tick one or more categories. 4,551 categories were provided by respondents. The table below shows a breakdown of these, with percentages given as a proportion of the total categories provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of respondent</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total categories provided</td>
<td>4551</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A local resident</td>
<td>2106</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A local business owner</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed locally</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A visitor to the area</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A commuter to the area</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not local but interested in the scheme</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A taxi/private hire vehicle driver</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 Modes of transport

We asked respondents to tell us what modes of transport they usually use to travel locally and to tick all options that apply. A total of 9,312 modes were recorded from respondents that answered this question. Percentages are given as a proportion of the total number of modes of transport provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of transport</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total modes provided</td>
<td>9312</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle</td>
<td>2252</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk / Wheelchair</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private car</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle / powered two-wheeler</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorry</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Summary of consultation responses

4.1 About this chapter

The CS4 route was divided into 10 sections to make it easier for people to digest the information and give feedback on areas of particular interest to them. We asked respondents 10 closed questions, allowing them to select an answer that matched their level of support or opposition to the overall scheme and each of its route sections. No questions were asked about Section 5 (Lower Road) as this section will be consulted on at a later date. Of all the questions in the survey, only the closed question on the overall scheme (Question 1) was mandatory.

We also asked 10 open questions which allowed respondents to comment on the overall scheme as well as the ten sections. We did not invite comment about Section 5 (Lower Road).

Stakeholder responses are included in all the results in this chapter, and percentages are calculated from the number of respondents for each question. Only the question asking for the level of support for the overall scheme was mandatory for online respondents.

4.2 Question 1: “Do you support the overall proposals?”

This question was mandatory. Therefore, all 3,265 respondents answered this question by expressing their level of support for the overall proposals. Options to answer were: **Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose**. If respondents did not provide an answer to this question (because they submitted an email or letter rather than using our online survey) and there was an obvious support or otherwise for the scheme, then our analysts inferred a response based on the comments provided.

Respondents were generally in favour of the proposals as shown in the graph below, with 83 per cent supporting or strongly supporting the scheme, while 14 per cent opposed or strongly opposed it. Three per cent neither supported nor opposed the scheme.

Of the 253 responses for which we inferred a level of support, 128 (51 per cent) supported the scheme, 92 (36 per cent) opposed it and 33 (13 per cent) neither supported nor opposed the scheme.
4.2.1 Overall support for CS4 proposals

Support for CS4 was high among respondents from across all three London Boroughs, as shown by the graph below.

4.2.2 Overall support for CS4 proposals by London Boroughs on the route

Support for CS4 was high among respondents from across all three London Boroughs, as shown by the graph below.
73 per cent of respondents resident in Southwark supported or strongly supported while 23 per cent opposed or strongly opposed.

In the London Borough of Lewisham, 90 per cent of respondents supported or strongly supported the scheme while 8 per cent opposed or strongly opposed.

In the Royal Borough of Greenwich, 91 per cent of respondents supported or strongly supported the scheme while 6 per cent opposed or strongly opposed.

This analysis is based on the postcodes submitted by respondents and has also been mapped below.
4.2.3 Map showing distribution of respondents by postcode and level of support
4.3 Question 2: “Do you have any comments on the overall proposals?”

2,230 of the 3,265 respondents provided comments on the overall proposals for CS4. The table below shows the ten most frequently raised issues in their responses. Detailed analysis of all questions can be found in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support CS4 as it will be safer for cyclists than the current road layout</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion that we ensure CS4 comes to Lower Road</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for segregated cycle tracks on CS4</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern CS4 will worsen existing congestion on the route</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that existing layout is dangerous for cycling</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support CS4 as it will generally increase cycling in the area, e.g. for shopping, leisure, commuting</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggest CS4 extends to Woolwich</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that CS4 will worsen existing pollution on the route</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support as I am an existing cyclist who uses the route and CS4 will benefit my journey</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support CS4 as it will help reduce air / noise pollution and / or provide other environmental benefits</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Question 3: “Do you support the proposals for Tooley Street / Tower Bridge Road?”

2,950 respondents answered this question by expressing their level of support for the Tooley Street / Tower Bridge Road proposals (Section 1). Options to answer were: Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor oppose</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (% )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor oppose</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.1 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for Tooley Street / Tower Bridge Road?”

620 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Tooley Street/ Tower Bridge Road. The table below shows the ten most frequently raised issues in their responses. Detailed analysis of all open questions is contained in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern about safety of cyclists using bus lanes</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for segregated cycle tracks on CS4</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support CS4 as it will be safer for cyclists than current road layout</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that CS4 will worsen existing congestion on the route</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about cyclists turning into and out of Tower Bridge Road</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that existing layout is dangerous for cycling</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about cyclists’ safety from vehicles crossing cycle tracks</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding existing congestion</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggest CS4 extends further to London Bridge</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5 Question 4: “Do you support the proposals for Jamaica Road / Bevington Street?”

2,939 respondents answered this question by expressing their level of support for the Jamaica Road / Bevington Street proposals (Section 2). Options to answer were: Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor oppose</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.1 “Do you have any comments about the proposals for Jamaica Road / Bevington Street?”

373 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Jamaica Road / Bevington Street. The table below shows the ten most frequently raised issues in their responses. Detailed analysis of all open questions is contained in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding existing congestion on CS4 route</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that CS4 will worsen existing congestion on the route</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support CS4 as it will be safer for cyclists than current road layout</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for segregated cycle tracks on CS4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that existing layout is dangerous for cycling</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding cyclist access into and out of St James' Road</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about impact on local residents</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that CS4 will cause bus delays</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that CS4 will worsen existing pollution on the route</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about staggered crossings for pedestrians, especially for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedestrians with buggies, wheelchairs or children</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 Questions 5: “Do you support the proposals for Jamaica Road / Southwark Park Road?”

2,941 respondents answered this question by expressing their level of support for the Jamaica Road / Southwark Park Road proposals (Section 3). Options to answer were: Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose.

4.6.1 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for Jamaica Road / Southwark Park Road?”

517 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Jamaica Road / Southwark Park Road. The table below shows the ten most frequently raised issues in their responses. Detailed analysis of all open questions is contained in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to junction needed to benefit cycle safety</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about changing cycle track from north to south (at Southwark Park Road) increasing waiting times for cyclists</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that CS4 will worsen existing congestion on the route</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding existing congestion on CS4 route</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about cyclists’ safety from vehicles crossing cycle tracks</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that existing layout is dangerous for cycling</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support CS4 as it will be safer for cyclists than current road layout</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that CS4 will cause bus delays</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that cyclists might use the highway instead of cycle track</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for segregated cycle tracks on CS4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7 Question 6: “Do you support the proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout?”

2,946 respondents answered this question by expressing their level of support for the Rotherhithe Roundabout proposals (Section 4). Options to answer were: Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern that the existing layout of Rotherhithe Roundabout is dangerous for cycling</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about existing congestion at Rotherhithe Roundabout and the approach</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support CS4 as it allows cyclists to bypass roundabout</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support CS4 improvements at Rotherhithe roundabout as it will be safer for cycling than current road layout</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that CS4 will worsen existing congestion</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for segregated cycle tracks at Rotherhithe roundabout</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further improvements to traffic flow required</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about driver behaviour at proposed parallel cycle / pedestrian crossings</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7.1 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout?”

731 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout. The table below shows the ten most frequently raised issues in their responses. Detailed analysis of all open questions is contained in Appendix A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern about safety of proposed parallel pedestrian / cycle crossings over two-lane road</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding existing congestion making cycling dangerous or difficult at Rotherhithe roundabout</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8 Question 7: “Do you support the proposals for Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road?”

2,934 respondents answered this question by expressing their level of support for the Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road proposals (Section 6). Options to answer were: Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose.

4.8.1 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road?”

455 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road. The table below shows the ten most frequently raised issues in their responses. Detailed analysis of all open questions is contained in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern that toucan crossing of Oxestalls Road is inconvenient for cyclists</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signalised junction needed at Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about collision risk of mixing school children and cyclists at Oxestalls Road toucan crossing</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that cyclists will use highway rather than toucan at junction of Oxestalls Road / Evelyn Street</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose mini-roundabout at Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More direct crossing / priority for cyclists needed at junction of Oxestalls Road / Evelyn Street</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filter Oxestalls Road to prevent through motor traffic</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that CS4 will worsen existing congestion</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-junction required at Oxestalls Road / Evelyn Street junction instead of mini-roundabout</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about mini-roundabout at Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road - unsure if right solution</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.9 Question 8: “Do you support the proposals for Evelyn Street / Abinger Grove?”

2,931 respondents answered this question by expressing their level of support for the Evelyn Street / Abinger Grove proposals (Section 7). Options to answer were: Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose.

![Bar chart showing responses to Question 8]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oppose</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not answered</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9.1 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for Evelyn Street / Abinger Grove?”

316 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Evelyn Street / Abinger Grove. The table below shows the ten most frequently raised issues in their responses. Detailed analysis of all open questions is contained in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS4 should connect with Quietway 1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that CS4 will worsen existing congestion on the route</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for filtering of traffic at Sayes Court / Prince Street junction from Evelyn Street</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding rat running on Prince Street, Watergate Street, Borthwick Street, Deptford Green, Stowage and Gonson Street</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for segregated cycle tracks on CS4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that CS4 will cause bus delays</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that CS4 will worsen existing pollution on the route</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding existing congestion on CS4 route</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose the banned right turns</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A traffic light controlled junction should be installed instead of a mini roundabout at Abinger Grove junction</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.10 Question 9: “Do you support the proposals for Evelyn Street / Deptford High Street?”

2,928 respondents answered this question by expressing their level of support for the Evelyn Street / Deptford High Street proposals (Section 8). Options to answer were: Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose.

4.10.1 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for Evelyn Street / Deptford High Street?”

348 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Evelyn Street / Deptford High Street. The table below shows the ten most frequently raised issues in their responses. Detailed analysis of all open questions is contained in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern that CS4 will worsen existing congestion</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support CS4 as it will be safer for cyclists than current road layout</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS4 should connect with Quietway 1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose banned right turns at Deptford High Street / Evelyn Street junction</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional planting needed along CS4 route</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding loss of tree at New King Street</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for segregated cycle tracks on CS4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Query regarding right turn on to Deptford High Street coming from the west</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for banned right turns at Deptford High Street / Evelyn Street junction</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that existing layout is dangerous for pedestrians</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.11 Question 10: “Do you support the proposals for Creek Road / Deptford Church Street?”

2,932 respondents answered this question by expressing their level of support for the Creek Road / Deptford Church Street proposals (Section 9). Options to answer were: Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose.

4.11.1 “Do you have any comments on the proposals for Creek Road / Deptford Church Street?”

373 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Creek Road / Deptford Church Street. The table below shows the ten most frequently raised issues in their responses. Detailed analysis of all open questions is contained in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segregated CS4 should extend along Deptford Church Street</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support segregated cycle tracks on CS4 route</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that existing layout is dangerous for cycling around Deptford Church Street / Creek Road</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that CS4 will cause bus delays</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS4 should connect with Quietway 1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose removal of bus lane</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for wider cycle tracks</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose staggered pedestrian crossings on CS4 route</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for cyclist bypass of Deptford Church Street junction</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for safer right turning into Deptford Church Street for cyclists</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.12 Question 11: “Do you support the proposals for Creek Road / Norway Street?”

2,926 respondents answered this question by expressing their level of support for the Creek Road/Norway Street proposals (Section 10). Options to answer were: *Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose.*

4.12.1 “Do you have comments on the proposals for Creek Road / Norway Street?”

400 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Creek Road / Norway Street. The table below shows the ten most frequently raised issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS4 should be extended to Greenwich town centre</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS4 should be extended to Woolwich</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support segregated cycle tracks on CS4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS4 should be extended to Greenwich Park</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn into Haddo Street should be maintained</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support CS4 link to the Thames Path</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS4 should connect with Quietway 1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support measures to improve cycle infrastructure at the Greenwich gyratory</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS4 should extend further east / south east / south (not specified)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about retention of banned left turn from Norway Road on to Creek Road</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.13 Summary of stakeholder responses

This section provides summaries of the feedback we received from stakeholders. The full stakeholder responses are always used for analysis purposes. As well as being summarised here, the stakeholder responses are included in the analysis of overall responses covered in this chapter and in Appendix A.

4.13.1 Local authorities

London Borough of Lewisham

Lewisham Council welcomes the CS4 proposals on its section of the route. They support schemes that increase walking and cycling as it aligns with the Council’s target to reduce pollution and improve the health of its residents and visitors.

The Council is pleased to see the high level of service offered to potential cyclists on CS4 and the elimination of cycle collision hotspots such as Grinstead Road. They hope that the same high level of service continues as the design progresses.

Lewisham Council accepts the traffic modelling presented for the current design and has requested to be consulted if the designs change, so that they can reassess any changes for impact on buses, general traffic and cyclists.

Evelyn Street and Oxestalls Road (Section 6)

Lewisham Council supports the two-way track in this section. They feel the 6m wide Toucan crossing on Oxestalls is an acceptable compromise on their desired solution and will benefit Deptford Green School. They understand that a signalised junction is unachievable here, given the location constraints and network performance issues.

They requested reassurance that the mini roundabout at Oxestalls Road junction will be monitored post construction. They also suggested mitigation measures around Grinstead road to offset the issues caused by the relocation of the pedestrian crossing on Evelyn Street.

They would like to explore retaining Bus Stop U using land within the Timber Yard boundary.

Evelyn Street / Abinger Grove (Section 7)

Lewisham Council has suggested that we engage with Lewisham Homes as well as shops along Evelyn Street to understand their loading requirements and avoid negative impacts. Lewisham Council is keen to maintain as much effective Bus Lane as possible. The Council has requested clarity about useable footway in front of the Black Horse pub, to avoid pedestrian/patron issues for the pub.
Evelyn Street / Deptford High Street (Section 8)

Lewisham Council has suggested engagement with and careful co-ordination with bordering schemes (Convoys Wharf and Deptford High Street) prior to construction. They are aware of the mixed response regarding the banned turns in and out of Deptford High Street and are keen to maintain dialogue with us. They would like to develop proposals for the paved area created from narrowing New King Street.

Creek road / Deptford Church Street (Section 9)

Lewisham Council suggested an extension of the protection for cyclists entering Church Street from CS4 and also to consider linking CS4 with Quietway 1 at Bronze Street. They would like to know what our plans for the large area of footway created on the south east corner of Deptford Church Street.

London Borough of Southwark

Southwark Council supports CS4 in principle. However they believe our proposals could be improved and therefore do not support them at this time. They expressed concern that the proposals would cause deterioration in air quality on residential streets, increase bus journey times, displace motor traffic to borough roads and impact egress on and off the peninsular.

They offered to work in partnership with us to address these issues. They stated their support for the Mayor’s aim to significantly increase sustainable transport – walking, cycling and public transport and referenced delivery of Quietways 1, 7 and 14 as a demonstration of their commitment to supporting measures that encourage safe cycling in Southwark.

The Council suggested that we investigate the following amendments to the current design proposals;

- Banning the right turn for general traffic onto Jamaica Road from Southwark Park Road
- Extending the two lane approach on the Southwark Park with a bus lane
- Opening the Lower Road bus bypass/lane at Rotherhithe Roundabout to all traffic
- Widening the cycle route for two abreast on Jamaica Road, particularly if this creates the possibility for a pedestrian phase on the western arm

Southwark Council has also asked that we consider complementary measures to ensure that residents and those living closest to CS4 realise the benefits of our proposals. The Council has requested our support on the design of the Lower Road Gyratory and the investigation of measures to reduce the amount of through traffic using the CS4 route, particularly to access Rotherhithe Tunnel. They also suggested that we extend cycle hire schemes along the CS4 route, provide more pedestrian crossings on Jamaica Road, increase air quality monitors along the route and introduce complementary behaviour change programmes for schools.
**Royal Borough of Greenwich**

Greenwich Council sees CS4 as a key part of the council’s Cycling Strategy to help deliver their wider objectives of ensuring more residents are physically active and able to breathe clean air. They see the consultation as a positive step and look forward to working with us to deliver the full route to Woolwich.

The Council are supportive of the proposals, for the most part but outlined several areas for further consideration:

**Greenwich Town Centre (GTC)**

The council has called on us to work together to deliver a way of connecting cyclists to and from the end point of CS4 through the town centre in a way that complements their Liveable Neighbourhood aspirations for GTC and the wider area. They also called for our support in prioritising walking and cycling in the use of road space.

**Silvertown Tunnel**

The council called for both CS4 and Silvertown Tunnel to be assessed within one strategic model to provide a clearer picture of the combined impact of both these proposals on borough roads and local air quality.

**Buses**

The council welcomes our traffic modelling results for CS4, which suggest bus journey times would remain the same in the morning peak and potentially improve in the evening peak for routes 188, 199 and 47, but hold reservations as to whether these modelling results will be realised. They also welcome bus stop bypasses. However, they have called for pedestrian crossing points to be prioritised across the cycle track and suggested zebra crossings or other formal crossing points are considered at bus stops and throughout the route.

**Road Safety**

The council believes that the proposals for Creek Road would improve overall safety and called for a quick delivery due to the collision record of the area. They are concerned about and question the removal of guard railings, which in some areas are considered essential to the safety of pedestrians, unless alternative barriers such as raised planters are implemented in their place.

**Watergate Street**

The council particularly supports the proposed banned right turn from Watergate Street to the A200 as they believe that this measure coupled with their own interventions would help to resolve the issues caused by rat running in the area.
4.13.2 Politicians

**Caroline Pidgeon, London Assembly Member (Liberal Democrat), Deputy Chair of Transport Committee**

The Assembly Member suggested that delivery of CS4 if integrated with Rotherhithe to Canary Wharf Bridge and the extension of cycle hire to Rotherhithe would offer new travel options for people in south east London and help to reduce congestion and air pollution. She also endorsed the points raised by Councillor Anood Al-Samerai on behalf of the Liberal Democrat group on Southwark Council.

She expressed disappointment that the proposals end short of Greenwich Town Centre and suggested that the route continues through Greenwich and Charlton to Woolwich.

She expressed concern that Silvertown Tunnel and the tolling of Blackwall Tunnel would increase traffic accessing Rotherhithe Tunnel. In addition, she was concerned about the safety of bus stop bypasses for vulnerable pedestrians and suggested that the current trials of zebra crossings at bus stop bypasses are completed and the recommendations fully implemented in the design of bus stop bypasses on CS4.

**Councillor Stephanie Cryan - Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing, Labour Member for Rotherhithe Ward &**

**Councillor Bill Williams - Chair of Bermondsey & Rotherhithe Community Council, Labour Member for Rotherhithe Ward**

Councillors Cryan and Williams support the idea of a cycle superhighway in principle and the benefits of making it easier and safer to cycle. However they do not support the current proposals and believe that the Jamaica Road and Rotherhithe Tunnel section of the route need much more scoping and consultation.

They suggest TfL prioritise tackling commuter traffic in the area before any plans for CS4 are put into place and consider radical solutions like; tolling the tunnel, a local congestion charge (with local residents exempt) or one-way flow of traffic in the tunnel based on peak demands.

They both expressed concern at the increase in bus journey times due to CS4 as well as the recent reduction in frequency on the P12 and 47 bus routes. They were also concerned at the impact CS4 would have on already high levels of pollution for residents living on Southwark Park Road. They suggested that CS4 should be delayed until better solutions are developed.

Councillor Williams adds that as a cyclist, he finds crossing Jamaica Road to follow the designated Cycle Path very dangerous.

**Liberal Democrat Group, Southwark Council**

The Liberal Democrat Group sees CS4 as a once-in-a-generation opportunity to redesign Jamaica road and dramatically reduce delays. They believe the proposals
do not capitalise on this and find it unacceptable that the plans do nothing to reduce the heavy congestion on Jamaica Road. They see this as the overriding priority for the area due to the economic, environmental and health costs. They expressed concern about the existing high level of congestion, pollution with its’ resulting health impacts on Southwark residents, the many bus routes affected by CS4, and the poor road safety record on Jamaica Road.

They also expressed concern that congestion will be worsened by CS4 crossing at the West Lane junction and that the impending tolling of Blackwall Tunnel will push even more traffic to Rotherhithe Tunnel. It was also suggested that Southwark Council’s Lower Road proposals should be included in the CS4 consultation.

They acknowledged and supported some elements of CS4 such as:
- Proposals at Rotherhithe roundabout
- Removal of central reservation on Jamaica Road
- Segregated cycle tracks
- Extension of the cycle track into Brunel Road
- Banned left turn in Bevington Street
- Use of bus stop bypasses for cyclists

Other suggestions made by the Liberal Democrat Group were; a pedestrian/cycle bridge from Southwark Park to Kings Stairs Gardens, moving the cycle lane to the South side of Jamaica Road for its entire length, additional electronic warning signs for Rotherhithe Tunnel journey times/queue lengths along the route, cycle lanes on Tower Bridge, integrating CS4 plans with Rotherhithe bridge, tolling the tunnel, a one-way flow of traffic in the tunnel based on peak demands, extend cycle hire schemes along Jamaica Road and increasing air quality monitors in the area with public live-feed air quality display signs at roadsides.

**Simon Hughes, former Liberal Democrat Member of Parliament for Bermondsey and Old Southwark**

Simon Hughes opposes the current proposals and believes they should not be proceeded with until they are supported by Southwark Council.

He supports the responses submitted by Southwark Council and the Liberal Democrat group. He suggested that CS4 should not proceed until proposals for CS4 have been integrated with plans for Lower Road and the Rotherhithe – Canary Wharf Bridge. He also suggested alternative route via Bricklayers Arms and Old Kent Road be considered as well as on-road marked cycle lanes instead of segregated cycle tracks on Tooley Street and Jamaica Road.

Mr Hughes expressed concern that CS4 would negatively impact some businesses on Tooley Street and Jamaica Road. He was also concerned that CS4 will worsen congestion and pollution during construction, and will not have a positive impact on safety, congestion or pollution after construction.
4.13.3 Transport and road user groups

**Alliance of British Drivers**

Alliance of British Drivers strongly opposed the overall proposals for CS4. They said it would increase congestion along the route and that the increase in journey times for general traffic is totally unacceptable. They suggest that cyclists or bus users should not be given priority over other road users. They suggested that we are making traffic congestion worse in London.

They said that Section 1 proposals looks more complicated than the existing layout. They oppose the bus gate and bus lane in Section 4. They welcomed the additional entry lane into Rotherhithe Tunnel. They said it is not clear that the proposals for Evelyn Street / Deptford High Street would reduce existing congestion at Deptford High Street junction.

**Brent Cyclists (London Cycling Campaign)**

Brent Cyclists strongly supported the overall proposals for CS4. They said that the route should be better connected with existing cycle routes. They suggested extending CS4 west to Blackfriars Road to connect with existing cycle routes, such as North-South Cycle Superhighway. They suggested that the gap at Lower Road should be resolved as soon as possible.

**Brewery Logistics Group (BLG)**

The BLG supports measures to improve safety for vulnerable road users and the need to reduce carbon emissions in London. However, they are concerned that the proposals would cause changes within the distribution industry, leading to increased congestion, which is already unacceptably high across London, more emissions and less space for deliveries. They suggest that we ensure deliveries in to London are not compromised by infrastructure planning aimed only at cyclists and pedestrians.

They suggest that sufficient loading bays are provided along the route for the current and future needs of businesses, including night deliveries. They are concerned that yellow line adjustments would have an adverse effect on general freight deliveries. They are also concerned that shared use of loading bays for deliveries and disabled parking is not practical as disabled motorists could park for longer periods.

They request that pubs must have loading bays near the cellar door to comply with Health and Safety regulations. They suggest that regular communication with local businesses about road changes should be sent to suppliers as well so that deliveries can be planned accordingly. They suggest that the plans should be considered in the context of a much broader picture than just the CS4 route and that they are open to continued engagement.
Cycling Embassy of Great Britain

The Cycling Embassy of Great Britain strongly supported the overall proposals for CS4. They suggested extending CS4 west towards Blackfriars Road and east to Greenwich. They expressed concern that Lower Road is not included in the scheme.

They suggested making the cycle path a level higher than the road, and ensuring the kerb between the cycle path and footway is low. They also suggested the use of centre-line markings on cycle paths and signage to reinforce the two way system.

They expressed concern about vehicle and cyclist conflicts at junctions and suggested filtering side roads, turning refuges or converting side roads into a one-way only system, as well as calls for area-wide traffic filtering to reduce traffic volumes.

They opposed the use of staggered and signalised pedestrian crossings. They suggested giving pedestrians priority at bus stops, using zebra crossings.

They opposed CS4 using bus lanes on the route. They expressed concern about cyclists entering CS4 from Tower Bridge Road.

They expressed concern about the following junctions and roads, and provided possible solutions:

- **Mill Street junction/Dockhead junction/George Row junction.** Suggested reducing the width of the road to slow down vehicles.
- **Bevington Street junction/St James’s Road junction.** Suggested measures to reduce vehicle traffic and cycling signage to reduce the risk of vehicle and cyclist collision.
- **Wilson Grove.** Suggested closing street to vehicles to reduce turning conflicts.
- **Cherry Garden Street.** Suggested making street entry only to vehicles.
- **Cherry Garden Street/Marigold Street.** Both streets should allow contraflow cycling.
- **Rotherhithe roundabout.** Concerned about cyclist safety when crossing two lanes of traffic. Suggested reducing this to one lane and using signage to create awareness of cyclists.
- **Oxestalls Road junction.** Suggested closing street to vehicles or making it one-way only.
- **Grove Street junction.** Suggested moving the cycle path further away from the road, to allow vehicles to wait to turn without obstructing the cycle path.
- **Sayes Court Street junction/Prince Street junction.** Suggested filtering these streets to remove vehicle interactions at their junctions.
- **New King Street/Watergate Street.** Suggested making streets one-way only and implementing two way cycle lanes.
- **Deptford Church Street.** Suggested extending segregation along this road.
• **Gonson Street junction.** Suggested ensuring that vehicles waiting to enter or exit this junction do not block the cycle path.

• **Norway Street junction/Norman road junction.** Suggested further separation of the cycle path and footway.

**Freight Transport Association (FTA)**

The Freight Transport Association supports cycle superhighways in principle. They suggest that the needs of all road users should be considered to maximise the use of limited road space for London’s overall benefit. They are concerned that CS4 would increase congestion and journey times, which would affect business productivity and lead to price increases. They are also concerned that increased congestion would result in more vans and lorries on the roads, increasing pollution and reducing road safety for all users.

They suggest that sufficient loading bays are provided along the route for the current needs of businesses, with no camber or kerb and 40 minutes loading time. They are concerned that shared use of loading bays for deliveries and disabled parking is not practical as disabled motorists could park for longer periods, impacting deliveries.

The FTA suggest that health and safety protocols of certain sectors such as breweries, Cash in Transit (CiT) and other high value deliveries are considered in our plans. They suggest the establishment of similar protocols for builders’ merchants, in the event of bulky deliveries having to be made across the cycle track or on-board cranes with stabiliser legs deployed across the cycle lane or footway. They suggest clear signage to ensure pedestrian safety during such activity.

They suggest rumble strips to advise cyclists of approaching loading bays or bus stops. They suggest traffic demand management to avoid congestion as well as timely communication during construction works so that they can plan accordingly.

**Greenwich Cyclists (London Cycling Campaign)**

Greenwich Cyclists strongly supported the overall proposals for CS4. They suggested that a consultation on extending CS4 to the Surrey Quays gyratory and to Greenwich and Woolwich should happen soon.

They suggested that CS4 should connect to other cycle routes such as Quietway 1 and that the bidirectional cycle lanes should be at least four metres wide. They expressed concern about the Southwark Park Road/Jamaica Road junction and said it is important to improve safety here.

They expressed concern about the construction of CS4 and said it should minimise any disruptions to existing users. They said that banned right turns are not relevant to the design of CS4 and should not be included in the consultation.

They support directing cyclists away from Rotherhithe Roundabout and the removal of the left turn filter lane from Creek Road into Deptford Church Street. They said the
additional travel demand resulting from the Convoys Wharf development needs to be accounted for.

They expressed concern about the following junctions and roads, and suggested possible solutions:

- **Haddo Street.** They suggested allowing cyclists exiting the street to join the diagonal crossing, which should be two-way
- **Norway Street/Creek Road/Norman Road junction.** They suggested giving cyclists priority over vehicles and making pedestrian crossing wider to allow cycle access
- **Petrol station east of Glaisher Street.** They suggested a stop line on garage side and give way line on highway side
- **Copperas Street and Waterlink Way.** Crossing needs to be suitable for cyclists

**Lewisham Cyclists (London Cycling Campaign)**

Lewisham Cyclists strongly supported the overall proposals for CS4, but make a number of suggestions for further improvements. They suggested extending CS4 to the Surrey Quays gyratory and also from Tower Bridge Road to London Bridge. They expressed concern that Lower Road is not included in the proposals and for the plans to be consulted on soon.

They opposed proposals for a mini-roundabout at Oxestalls Road and suggested options to retain a signal-controlled T-junction should be further examined. They suggested a three-phase signalled junction by banning the left turn into Oxestalls Road. They also suggested a modal filter on Oxestalls Road and cycle refuge crossings for access into Grinstead and Alloa Road.

They highlighted the importance of connecting CS4 and Quietway 1, through cycle routes in Deptford High Street, Greenwich town centre and on Canal Approach. They also suggested improving access to CS4 from Haddo Street.

They would like safe connecting routes to CS4 especially from Q1 and also Deptford High Street and Greenwich Town Centre. They remain concerned about how bikes will negotiate the Deptford High Street/New King Street Junction. They would like to see provision made to connect to Canal Approach.

The campaign expressed concern about the following junctions and roads, and suggested possible solutions:

- **Rolt Street.** They are concerned that the proposals are unclear as to how cyclists will access the street
- **Abinger Grove/Prince Street junction.** They are concerned about speeding traffic and rat-running and suggested a point closures to prevent this
- **McMillan Street.** They are concerned about cyclist safety at this junction and have suggested moving the junction west, introducing a slew and banning right turns from Creek road.

- **Deptford Church Street junction.** They are concerned that the southbound entry onto street and northbound exit provides inadequate protection for cyclists. They suggested extending CS4 further down Church Street and a ‘hold the left’ junction for exiting northbound.

- **Creekside/Gonson Street junction.** They are concerned about cyclist safety at this junction. They suggested moving junction west, introducing a slew and a signalised T junction.

- **Glaisher Street/Creek Road junction.** They are concerned about the potential for ‘left hooks’ and suggested ‘hold the left’ signalling.

- **Norman Road/Creek Road junction.** They are concerned that cyclist provision is not adequate and suggested an early start signal from Norman road.

- **Haddo Street.** Suggested an access lane from the Haddo Street Estate.

**Lewisham Living Streets**

Lewisham Living Streets do not oppose CS4 in principle but feel they must oppose the proposals for CS4 until the problems they raise are resolved. They expressed concern about bus stop and traffic light bypasses. They suggested that these should incorporate pedestrian priority and be designed based on their location, such as considering the number of vulnerable users in the area. They said that bus stop bypasses should have a four metre minimum crossing width and zebra crossings. They said that pedestrian bypass islands must include clear signage to warn of cycle paths and indicate zebra crossings. They suggested conducting surveys with pedestrians to ensure their needs are being met.

They oppose the use of staggered crossings unless at wide junctions and where necessity is demonstrable. They strongly opposed shared footways and said that cycle routes should take space from roads instead. They suggested CS4 should include a review and rationalisation of footway clutter. They suggested continuous pavements where pedestrians are given priority at junctions and that informal crossings should be provided on roads with high pedestrian demand.

They opposed the use of staggered crossings and suggested they are only used where necessary. They suggested pedestrian crossing speed is calculated at 0.6m/s instead of 1.2m/s. They suggested pedestrian countdown timers for any crossing where the wait is greater than 15 seconds. They suggested informal crossings at 100m intervals on streets with high pedestrian demand. They opposed the loss of signalised pedestrian crossing of Creek Road at Norway Street junction.

They requested the following supporting information:
Before and after pedestrian and traffic counts at all junctions on CS4 route (including casualty data)

Footway and crossing levels and widths (and existing and proposed pedestrian waiting and crossing times for signalised crossings)

London Cycling Campaign

The London Cycling Campaign supported the overall proposals for CS4. They suggested Lower Road needs to be included in proposals, as well as extensions west to London Bridge and the North-South and East-West Cycle Superhighways, and east to Greenwich and Woolwich. They call for all highway development to meet LCDS with a CLoS rating of 70 or above as a condition for the release of funding for schemes that are designed to accommodate growth in cycling.

They expressed concern that TfL has consulted on CS4 without finalised designs for Lower Road. They believe it is imperative that TfL, Southwark and any other involved parties move forward with a scheme rapidly for Lower Road that is in keeping with the quality and approach of the rest of CS4.

They are concerned that bidirectional cycle tracks are prone to collisions where side roads join. They call for more attention to the design of these junctions and for them to be considered (and the possible treatments) on a more area wide basis. They suggested that pedestrian crossings near side streets along the CS4 route should be converted to parallel pedestrian/cyclist or toucan crossings to enable cyclists to join CS4. They are concerned that some sections of CS4 are too narrow, and suggest that space from central reservations or lane widths should be reviewed as solutions to widen the cycle track. They suggest one-way side streets should include contraflow lanes for cyclists.

They suggested many junctions along the route where turning radii should be tightened to slow vehicle turning speeds. Examples are Dockhead, West Lane, George Row and Rainsborough Avenue.

They suggested parking bays by Potter’s Field are floated rather than on the footway side of the cycle track. They suggested Tower Bridge and Tower Bridge Road need to be improved for cyclists. They suggested taxi access to hotel west of Boss Street is not via CS4 cycle tracks. They suggested filtering Lafone Street and Three Oak Lane for through traffic. They suggested pedestrian crossing from Fair Street to Three Oak Lane becomes a parallel crossing and it relocates closer to Fair Street to improve access to CS4. They suggested removing central reservation west of Mill Street to widen cycle track.

They suggested cycle tracks continue along Abbey Street. They suggested St James’ Road junction allows protected cycling movements in all directions. They suggested reducing through traffic on Southwark Park Road by modal filtering. They
suggested Southwark Park Road / West Lane junction allows protected cycling movements in all directions.

They call for Bevington Street/ St James Road to be re-looked at for measures to reduce traffic and to promote safe and calm driving behaviour.

They suggested Brunel Road arm of Rotherhithe roundabout should cater for future cycle facilities. They are concerned about safety of pedestrians and cyclists having to cross two lanes of traffic at parallel crossings at Rotherhithe roundabout.

The campaign is concerned about the safety impacts of the design for Oxestalls Road junction. They suggested filtering through traffic into and out of Oxestalls Road to allow cyclists to continue along Evelyn Street and remove the need for the mini roundabout. They suggested improved cyclist crossing to access Grinstead Road via Quietway 1.

They suggested further improvements are required at Dragoon Road to prevent motor vehicles trying to access it. They suggested filtering of through traffic to reduce conflict with CS4 at Sayes Court Street / Prince Street junction with Evelyn Street. They suggested improving cyclists’ access to Deptford High Street via a toucan crossing. They suggested segregated cycle tracks on both sides of Deptford Church Street.

They suggested Glaisher Street should have straight ahead pedestrian crossing and no central refuge, and tighter turning radii. They suggested Norway Street / Norman Road junction allows protected cycling movements in all directions. They suggested improving Dowells Street / Norway Street junction for cyclists. They are concerned that the bus stop west of the end of CS4 on Creek Road is too close to the track entrance. They would like the scheme to be designed to work potential future schemes through Greenwich Town Centre to Woolwich.

**London Living Streets**

London Living Streets strongly supported the overall proposals for CS4. They expressed concern about the displacement of traffic on to residential roads. They suggested measures to reduce this, such as road pricing and extending the Congestion Charge Zone. They suggested 20mph speed limits on the route and the use of the TfL 20mph Toolkit to ensure compliance. They suggested the use of Copenhagen crossings throughout the CS4 route.

They expressed concern about bus stop bypasses and suggested that TfL follow best practice to minimise pedestrian and cyclist conflicts at them. They strongly opposed mini roundabouts on the CS4 route and suggested that they should be replaced by signalised junctions. They support removing guardrails on footways and the creation of public realm spaces.
They welcome the new pedestrian crossings but are concerned about their complexity. They would like to see them all as single stage and centre white lines removed where possible to encourage slower traffic speeds. They suggest that the West Lane junction needs to be re-designed to include a crossing on the western arm and the desire line for crossing on the eastern arm improved. They also called for the mini-roundabout at Abinger Grove to include pedestrian crossings on all arms.

**London TravelWatch**

London TravelWatch welcomes the expansion of cycling facilities into new parts of London.

They suggested further consideration of the following issues:

- The complexity of the road layouts proposed, avoiding infrastructure that creates confusion about where bicycles are
- The use of the pavement for cycle tracks should be reduced if possible to minimise inconvenience and worry, particularly for vulnerable pedestrians
- The use of bus stop bypasses is minimised or replaced by wide inside lanes as they may cause concern for vulnerable passengers
- Concerned that the loss of bus lanes will extend journey time and worsen reliability
- Concerned that two way cycle tracks may increase the risk of collisions between cyclists and pedestrians as well as cyclists and motorists
- Concerned about encroachment of cyclists onto pedestrian crossing areas. They suggest that ASLs are put in place to accommodate cyclists filtering to the front of traffic at signalised junctions.

**Road Haulage Association (RHA)**

The RHA is seriously concerned that the removal of lanes at any point on the CS4 route would lead to increased journey times and higher pollution. They suggest that as CS4 will be used mainly during the peak hours, there could be the ability for all vehicle use outside peak hours.

They request that we consider the space requirements of articulated Heavy Goods Vehicles (2.55 metres wide and up to 18.55m long) that would use the roads and junctions on CS4, where the carriageway width is reduced to 3 metres.

They request that Pubs must have loading bays near the cellar door.

They request that sufficient loading bays should be provided, for the sole use of commercial vehicles to service businesses and deliveries along the route, with a waiting time of forty minutes. They suggest that loading bays must be level with the pavement to prevent wheeled delivery baskets rolling onto the cycle lane. They are
concerned that failure to provide this will result in laden HGV’s causing increased congestion on roads and pollution whilst waiting for a vacant loading bay.

They suggest that rumble strips should be installed on the approaches to loading bays to warn cyclists of an impending loading bay hazard.

Southwark Cyclists (London Cycling Campaign)

Southwark Cyclists welcome the proposals for CS4 and called for plans for the Surrey Quays Gyratory to be consulted on quickly as they are concerned that CS4 would lose much of its value without good plans for the gyratory. They have also called for CS4 to be extended from Tower Bridge to London Bridge.

They are concerned the design is not future proofed to cope with anticipated cycle growth and suggest we ensure that CS4 could accommodate peak cycle flows of at least 2000 per hour. They called for bidirectional paths along CS4 to be at least 4m throughout rather than the proposed 3-4m.

Southwark Cyclists acknowledge that some road changes, in particular, banned turns at Shad Thames, Cathay Street and Marigold Street as well as the bus gate at Rotherhithe Roundabout has an impact on motor traffic. However, they suggested that these plans are irrelevant to CS4 and should be consulted on separately. They have called for an extra stage of traffic lights to allow cyclists enter and exit CS4 safely at St James Road as is proposed for Abbey Street.

They suggested that if the Shad Thames one way scheme is implemented, a cycle contra-flow route is needed for south / east bound cyclists as it is on the National Cycle Route 4 alignment and is also a popular route with cyclists.

Southwark Living Streets

Southwark Living Streets strongly supported the overall proposals for CS4. They supported the narrowing of road space for vehicles as this shortens pedestrian crossings. They suggested that pedestrian crossings should not be staggered, and that pedestrians should have priority over cyclists at crossings. They expressed concern about narrow footway space on the south side of Jamaica road.

They suggested continuing the cycle path along the north side of Jamaica Road with a new toucan crossing at the roundabout rather than crossing at the Southwark Park Road junction. They also suggested signals on the cycle way to ensure pedestrians have the opportunity to safely cross the cycle tracks, given likely volume of cyclists. They suggested connecting CS4 to Quietway 14 through Brunel Road, avoiding Rotherhithe Roundabout. They said that it is important that green infrastructure remains on Rotherhithe Roundabout.
Stagecoach London - Bus operator for routes 47 & 199 on the proposed route

Stagecoach supports the introduction of safer streets but opposes the removal of bus lanes on the route as it would reduce the resilience of bus routes 47 and 199. They are concerned that CS4 would worsen existing traffic capacity issues across the route and reduce the reliability of the buses particularly during morning and evening peak times. They are concerned that removing the signalised junction and installing a mini roundabout at Oxestalls Road would cause difficulties exiting on to the mini roundabout. They state that the section of bus lane between Deptford Church Street and Deptford High Street assists in exiting Deptford Church Street and they are concerned that the removal of this bus lane would create a traffic pinch point due to the narrowing of the traffic lane.

Stop Killing Cyclists

They strongly supported the overall proposals for CS4. They suggested that a consultation on extending CS4 to London Bridge, the Surrey Quays gyratory and to Greenwich and Woolwich should happen soon.

They would like assurance that CS4 can cope with rising numbers of cyclists and suggests that flows should be monitored using cycle counters. They requested that bidirectional cycle lanes should be at least four metres wide.

They expressed concern that some elements which are irrelevant to CS4 have been included in this consultation, such as one-way scheme at Shad Thames. These are detrimental to traffic and would like assurances that responses to these elements will be considered separately to CS4. They suggested that if Shad Thames becomes one-way then a cycle contraflow is needed.

They suggested 20mph speed limits on Jamaica Road, Lower Road and Evelyn Street. They also suggested cycle refuge crossings for access into Grinstead and Alloa Road.

They expressed concern about the following junctions and roads, and provided possible solutions:

- **St James’s Road.** Suggested that the traffic lights should have an extra stage.
- **Southwark Park Road.** Suggested that access to and from the road should be made clear.
- **Oxestalls Road mini roundabout.** Concerned this will create delays for cyclists. Suggested retaining a signalled T-junction and banning left turns from Evelyn Street into Oxestalls Road.
- **Sayes Court Road/Prince Street.** Concerned about speeding traffic and potential ‘left hooks’ for cyclists. Suggested filtering these roads.
• **Abinger Grove roundabout.** Concerned about cyclist safety. Suggested filtering Sayes Court Road and Prince Street to remove the need for this roundabout, and adding a pedestrian crossing.

• **New King Street/Evelyn Street junction.** Suggested making New King Street no entry and making the cycle path straight, to stop the need to remove a tree.

• **Deptford Church Street.** Concerned about cyclist safety. Suggested full segregation along the street, with ‘hold the left’ signalling at the junction with Creek Road. Suggested removing a southbound vehicle lane.

• **Glaisher Street/Creek Road junction.** Concerned about the potential for ‘left hooks’. Suggested ‘hold the left’ signalling.

• **Norman Road/Creek Road junction.** Concerned cyclist provision is not adequate. Suggested an early start signal from Norman Road.

• **Deptford High Street/Evelyn Street junction.** Concerned about pedestrian and cyclist conflict. They suggested a cycle crossing next to pedestrian conflict

**Sustrans**

Sustrans strongly supports the proposals for CS4 but have raised concerns over the timing of delivery and a number of design elements. They have called for the scheme to be extended east to Greenwich town centre and Woolwich as well as west to London Bridge and across the Thames.

They expressed concern about the lack of proposals for Lower Road and have called for proposals to be consulted on by the end of 2018. They are also concerned that two-way cycle tracks are not as safe as with-flow cycle tracks on either side of the road.

Sustrans supports the proposals for Tooley Street/Tower Bridge Road. However, they have expressed the following concerns:

- The risks of conflicts between left turning drivers and cyclists on Queen Elizabeth Street
- The pedestrian crossings at the junction of Tower Bridge Road and Tooley Street are too narrow for the volume of people using them
- The lack of segregated provision on Tower Bridge Road to aid people in accessing or leaving CS4
- The lack of a protected contra-flow cycle lane on Tanner Street for eastbound cyclists

They have called for a parallel toucan crossing across Tooley Street, to the south of the King’s Arms Public House to enable cycle connectivity between CS4 and Fair Street / Three Oak Lane. They would like a better design of Dockhead junction to reduce turning speeds.
The have suggested that we provide separate cycle signals for safe access across St James' Road, “straight-across” crossings for pedestrians across both St James' Road and Bevington Street, and a parallel pedestrian and cycle crossing for access across Marine Street and St James' CofE Primary school.

They are concerned that the proposals for Jamaica Road / Southwark Park Road would not allow cyclists to move safely between CS4, Southwark Park Road and West Lane.

They strongly support the proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout, but are concerned that the proposed crossings at the roundabout are too narrow to cater for the volume of cyclists and pedestrians expected. They are also concerned that there would be a pinch point as cyclists merge with faster general traffic joining Brunel Road. They suggested extending CS4 along Brunel Road as a link to the proposed Rotherhithe / Canary Wharf river crossing.

They are concerned that the mini roundabout at Oxestalls Road is a major diversion for cyclists on to a busy toucan crossing near a school. They suggest that CS4 should continue on a direct route through modifications to the existing signalised junction. They are concerned about the lack of protected connectivity for cyclists at Grinstead Road. They have called for speed calming measures and prioritisation of walking and cycling on all roads along Evelyn Street.

Sustrans are concerned that the mini-roundabout at the Abinger Grove / Evelyn Street junction lacks pedestrian facilities and connectivity for cyclists. They are also concerned about the potential conflict from vehicles turning across the cycle track into Prince Street / Sayes Court Street. They suggest area-wide filtering, connecting CS4 to Lewisham Council’s proposed ‘Canal Approach Greenway’ and public realm improvements on the shopping area between Grove Street and Sayes Street.

They would like to see the right-turn banned from Evelyn Street onto Watergate Street and improved cycle connectivity between CS4 and Deptford High Street. They are also concerned about the loss of cycle track on the edges of section 8 and 9.

They are concerned about the shared use footway and toucan crossing at Creekside and would like to see the design of Creek Road / Glashier Street junction improved.

They have called for the design proposals for the Creek Road / Norway Street to include dedicated signals phases that cater for cyclists and pedestrians on all movements, introduce traffic calming and a more delineated route for motor-vehicles on Norway Street, particularly the crossing between the Thames Path and CS4, and further narrowing the Haddo Street entrance as well as including pedestrian crossings.
4.13.4 Emergency services

**Metropolitan Police Road Safety Engineering Unit (SEU), Catford Traffic Garage**

The SEU expressed concerned that the blue surfacing used for cycle tracks is slippery and could cause accidents when cyclists brake. They were also concerned that leaves on parts of the CS4 route that are under tree cover would not be cleared.

They suggested using zig zag markings on cycle track approaches to signalised crossings. They are concerned the proposed Oxestalls Road toucan crossing would increase the risk of conflicts due to high pedestrian numbers and the likelihood of cyclists using the general highway instead.

They expressed concerned that the north-south pedestrian desire line across Evelyn Street from Abinger Grove to Prince Street is no longer catered for. They were also concerned that drivers would not respect the ‘no entry’ on to Evelyn Street from Prince Street.

They suggested improved cyclist access to Deptford High Street via a toucan crossing as well as camera enforcement of banned turns at Deptford High Street.

4.13.5 Community & Resident groups

**Deptford Folk & New Cross Learning**

Deptford Folk & New Cross Learning both support the proposals overall and look forward to its construction. They were particularly interested in the area close to Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens (section 6, 7, & 8 of the CS4 route).

They expressed concerns about poor pedestrian accessibility and high pollution in the area, with particular concern for the health of children attending Deptford Park School, which is adjacent to Oxestalls Road. They suggested that we plant new trees along the route to improve air quality and use the major regeneration planned for the area to improve the public realm as well as access to green spaces.

In addition, they endorsed the junction improvements suggested by Lewisham Cyclists at Oxestalls Road, Grinstead Road/Alloa Road, connection to Q1 and plans to re-open Canal Approach.

**Evelyn Parents Forum**

Evelyn Parents Forum strongly opposed CS4, and in particular the proposals for Section 6. They feel that it is unnecessary as the existing infrastructure, including bus lanes are sufficient for large numbers of cyclists to travel into central London, uninhibited by the gridlock that bus users and motorists regularly experience.

They oppose narrowing of the road space and the removal of bus lanes to increase cycle space as they as they are concerned that it would make the already high levels of congestion and pollution in the area worse, especially if Blackwall or Rotherhithe Tunnels have problems.
They oppose proposals for a mini roundabout at the Evelyn Street/Oxestalls Road junction as they are concerned for safety of local residents. They said that with hundreds of school children walking across cycle lanes, the risk of pedestrian / cyclists conflict and serious accidents would increase. They feel the existing traffic light system is safer for all local pedestrians.

They are concerned that relocating the bus stops on Evelyn Street would make walking more difficult for seniors in particular as they would have to walk further up Evelyn Street. They are particularly concerned that emergency services access in the area is already difficult and that CS4 would jeopardise access even more.

They suggest that as thousands of homes planned for an area that already has a high population density, the priority should be making improvements to pedestrian pavements and public transport, especially Canada Water and Surrey Docks stations which are already often overcrowded.

They suggested that we should enhance the current cycle provision with better visuals - road colouring, road markings and better signage. They also suggested directing cyclists down Grove street to the Thames Path and linking through the existing cycle route on to the proposed Rotherhithe – Canary Wharf crossing.

They have called for continuous engagement with key stakeholders to ensure that we fully understand the potential impacts on the area of this section of CS4.

**Pepys Community Forum**

The community group is opposed to CS4 and question the motive for what they see as an anti–car driving measure at a time when cars are evolving to ‘zero emission’ energy and ‘self drive’, benefitting many disabled users as well as reducing pollution.

They oppose the proposals for Evelyn Street/Oxestalls Road as it would not improve traffic flow during rush hour. They said the new pedestrian crossing would not work and oppose relocating bus stops away from local estates and amenities.

They oppose the banned turns at Evelyn Street/Deptford High Street, as they need to be able to turn right out of Deptford High Street

They are concerned that CS4 will create a hazard to all bus passengers getting on and off buses, especially in bad weather conditions and low light.

They are also concerned that the cycle track will remain empty for most of the day apart from rush hour and suggest that cyclists choose from many green park routes rather than use the main highways.

They suggest that the real need is to change the commercial fleets - vans, lorries, and similar - to less polluting transport and maximise other road alternatives such as river transport and rail.
They suggested that we should aim to enhance the road experience for everyone and consider variable time phasing of all traffic light control points, according to 'real time' demand in order to improve traffic flow.

**Shad Thames Independent Group (STIG), Curlew Street Residents’ Association and Boss House Management Company**

The groups named above oppose the proposals for CS4. They said CS4 is not a priority for the area as the existing infrastructure is sufficient for cycling needs. They said it is a waste of tax payers’ money and would be underused.

They are concerned that the proposals would affect parking provision as well as delivery and collection vehicles, resulting in a loss of amenity for local residents, increased congestion, increased air and noise pollution and increased risk of improper or dangerous driving behaviour. They are also concerned bus journey times would increase as a result of the removal of bus lanes in the area, thereby discouraging bus use.

They strongly opposed making Shad Thames one-way only, because they are concerned that this will cause a displacement of traffic onto residential roads, in particular Lafone Street which will carry most of traffic travelling north and west (via Tanner Street / Druid Street one-way) and east (via Tooley Street / Jamaica Road).

They suggested that CS4 should be consulted on with all designs (including Lower Road) in place and should be done in conjunction with proposals for the Rotherhithe-Canary Wharf river crossing. They suggested that we focus on introducing low emission zones, resolve issues with existing Cycle Superhighways, consolidating deliveries and collections and implementing vehicle limits to ease congestion. They also suggested working more closely with Southwark Council to develop solutions for the area.

**The Deptford Society**

The Deptford Society stated that they strongly supported the overall proposals for CS4. However, they opposed some proposals for specific sections of the route. They suggested that links to other key cycle routes are considered and that proposals for the Lower Road section are brought forward as soon as possible.

They opposed the changes at Oxestalls Road (Section 6) as they are concerned at the possibility of conflict between pedestrians and cyclists. They suggested that the junction remains signal controlled, left turns are banned and cyclists continue on a green phase shared with the pedestrian crossing on Oxestalls Road.

The society also opposed the removal of a mature tree to accommodate the cycle track in Section 8, suggested that CS4 proposals, in general, are not green enough, and that they should include replacement planting where trees are lost.
Twinkle Park Trust

The Twinkle Park Trust opposes the proposals for Evelyn Street/Deptford High Street without additional measures such as a traffic gate on Prince Street, between New King Street and Watergate Street and one on Stowage, with the right turn ban on Watergate Street to prevent rat running on the residential roads between Prince Street and Gonson Street.

They are concerned that the current proposals would increase the already high level of rat running on Watergate Street, Borthwick Street, Deptford Green and Stowage. They are concerned that this would create many problems for local residents and users of Twinkle Park and Charlotte Turner Gardens.

What’s on in Rotherhithe Group

The ‘What’s on in Rotherhithe Group’ are broadly supportive of our proposals but did have some recommendations. They suggested that the pedestrian zebra crossing on Jamaica Road at Rotherhithe Roundabout should be upgraded to a signalised ‘Toucan’ crossing to improve safety due to high pedestrian footfall. They expressed the opinion that the provision of a pedestrian / cycle bridge across Jamaica Road to link King’s Stairs Gardens with Southwark Park would be an even better solution.

They suggested that the cycle track should not cross to the south side of Jamaica Road at West Lane but instead continue along the north side as far as the Rotherhithe Roundabout and cross to the south side via a new signalised ‘toucan’ crossing at the Rotherhithe Roundabout. They expressed concern that many cyclists who travel between Brunel Road and Central London are unlikely to cross Jamaica Road twice in such quick succession, but will instead remain on the north side of Jamaica Road and either cycle on the main carriageway (if heading east), or the north pavement (if heading west), increasing the risk of pedestrian / cyclists conflict at places like the Southwark Park bus stop (on the south side of Jamaica Road).

They also suggested that we use zebra crossings across the route in order to give pedestrians priority and improve safety, particularly for vulnerable pedestrians.

The suggested the route should link the north side of Brunel Road with the south side of Mayflower Street, connecting Cottle Way, which is already designated as a shared east-west cycle path.
4.13.6 Accessibility groups

**Wheels for Wellbeing**

Wheels for Wellbeing welcomes the explicit acknowledgement of disabled cycling in the cycle superhighways material. They support the proposals as disabled cyclists would be protected from hostile road environments. They suggest that our plans should promote inclusive cycling along the route. They are concerned that cyclists face some difficulties when leaving the cycle lane to access high street amenities.

They suggest that clear signage is used at Tooley Street to direct CS4 and Quietway 14 users, as it links to local government, transport and other amenities in London Bridge. They are disappointed that there is no cycling provision on Shad Thames and are concerned about the safety of the bend onto the cycle track from Dockhead.

They suggest that the gaps between signalled crossings along Jamaica Road and Bevington Street should be shorter to allow easy access to both sides of the street. They are concerned that the junction with West Lane and Southwark Park Road has no pedestrian crossings on the western arm, making it more difficult for disabled cyclists to access shops on the southern side.

They suggest we monitor the crossings at Rotherhithe Roundabout and consider other alternatives for cyclists. They are concerned that barriers to disabled cycling within Southwark Park could be an issue until Lower Road proposals are delivered. They also suggest linking Brunel Road to the Rotherhithe - Canary Wharf crossing.

They are concerned about the toucan crossing at Oxestalls Road. They suggest a straighter, high capacity approach due to the volume of cyclists. They suggest that CS4 is properly integrated with the existing Quietway route in the area. They suggest that there should be clear signage about the links and ample space to turn and activate toucans. They suggest separate cycle and pedestrian crossings.

They suggest that signage must be very clear, particularly on access to Deptford High Street. They suggest linking CS4 into Deptford Church Street. They suggest a with-flow cycle track on Deptford Church Street to link up with Quietway 1. They suggest that the link into Norway Street should connect to the existing NCN route 4 nearby. They again suggest that we join up the entire cycling infrastructure.

4.13.7 Developers and construction companies

**Bazalgette Tunnel Limited - Infrastructure provider for Thames Tideway Tunnel**

Tideway is delivering a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project with 21 major construction sites across central London. Construction has started will continue for about 5 years. A large number of construction vehicles access these construction sites and 4 of the work sites are on junctions along the CS4 route.
Tideway supports CS4 proposals and welcomes infrastructure that encourage safe cycling. They believe it could increase the number of Thames Tideway Tunnel staff cycling to work. However, they are concerned that the construction and operation of CS4 does not affect their ability to access work sites during the next 5 years.

Their Chamber’s Wharf site is located within Section 2 of the proposed route. They request that we ensure the right turn into Bevington Street from Jamaica Road (east) can safely accommodate 16.5m length articulated HGVs and 12m length rigid HGVs. They are concerned that a proposed new traffic island at the southern end of Bevington Street could obstruct this. They suggest allowing sufficient time for at least two HGVs to turn right into Bevington Street in any one traffic phase to minimise queuing on Jamaica Road. They suggest installing removable street furniture at this junction to facilitate the turning of Abnormal Indivisible Loads into Bevington Street. They suggest that clear signage is placed along this section of CS4 to advise cyclists of construction traffic, if Tideway is still under construction when CS4 is operational.

Their Earl Pumping Station site is located within Section 5 (Lower Road) of the route. They request notification when this goes to consultation and that their requirements are considered during the Strategic Transport Study with Southwark Council.

Tideway’s Deptford Church Street work site is located in Sections 9 and 10 of CS4. They request that the right turn in to Creek Road from Deptford Church Street from the south can safely accommodate 16.5m length HGVs and 12m length rigid HGVs. The approved egress route from this worksite involves a right turn into Norman Road from Creek Road eastbound. They request that this turn can safely accommodate 16.5m length articulated HGVs and 12m length rigid HGVs. They suggest a swept path analysis to reassure that the manoeuvres can be achieved safely. They are concerned about the impact of the proposed cycle track diagonally traversing this junction from the north side to the south side of Creek Road.

Their Greenwich Pumping Station work site is located within Section 10 of the route. Access to this site is required from both the southern and northern ends of Norman Road. They request that both the right and left turns in to Norman Road from Creek Road can accommodate 16.5m length articulated HGVs and 12m length rigid HGVs.

Tideway state that they are committed to minimising the impact of its construction works on the community and the environment, but stress that this is dependent in part on the efficient movement of construction traffic, which requires unhindered use of their key construction traffic routes. They state that they have adopted measures to ensure the safety of cyclists and other road users, such as driver training and the requirement of its contractors and supply chain to use vehicles fitted with indirect visual aids and other enhanced safety equipment.

**British Land – Canada Water Redevelopment**

British Land support the development of improved cycling facilities in this part of London. They are keen to develop the optimum transport strategy for the area and
believe that the scheme supports the Mayor’s Transport Strategy as well as the Canada Water Regeneration Masterplan. They expect the scheme to increase local uptake in cycling, including new residents. They suggest further consideration of the scheme design to ensure that it integrates with the emerging transport strategy for the Canada Water Opportunity Area and delivers benefits to all road users.

They are concerned at the high levels of traffic demand, congestion, poor air quality, noise problems, along the A200 corridor, which limits people’s mobility. They note that this is mainly due to demand for access to Rotherhithe Tunnel, and is made worse whenever there are problems at Blackwall Tunnel.

They are concerned that the reduction in road capacity at junctions along the CS4 corridor would lead to increased delays and congestion on other local roads. They note that bus journey times are already significantly extended in peak periods and that bus journeys are often shortened or terminated early because of delays. They are concerned that regularly inconveniencing bus users will lead to reduced bus use and revenues.

They suggest that demand for bus services is likely to increase significantly in the future as a result of regeneration and state that they are committed to funding bus improvement measures to support the Canada Water Masterplan. However, they are concerned that the current proposals place too much emphasis on cyclists, at the expense of bus users. They suggest a balanced approach that benefits bus users as well by improving bus lane coverage significantly or through other bus priority measures to improve journey times.

British Land stated that they are not responsible for the absence of Lower Road proposals from the consultation and are concerned at the lack of information on that section. They expressed concern that CS4 proposals were prematurely concluded without considering the traffic modelling analysis and conclusions of the impending Strategic Transport Study (STS). They suggest that the current traffic modelling results are subject to change, following the conclusion of the STS, making it difficult at this point to have a clear understanding of its influences on the optimum transport strategy for the Canada Water Masterplan in particular and the wider area in general.

They are also concerned that the travelling impact modelling at a ‘whole-route’ level is misleading as the majority of bus journeys are relatively short. They are concerned that users on short journeys will more likely experience increases in journey time. They are concerned about apparent inconsistencies in the ‘Table of journey times’ that was published with the consultation material and have requested further details.

They are concerned that the predicted journey time increase for vehicles leaving the peninsula from Brunel Road will also affect bus journeys adversely, and that the delays may extend further in to the peninsula than was implied in the consultation.

British Land suggests that we consider alternative routes other than Jamaica Road / Lower Road in order to improve bus journey times in that corridor. They suggest
routing CS4 south through Southwark Park, or north through the existing cycle routes. They suggest continuous monitoring of bus journey times and interventions when necessary to improve bus journey times and reliability.

**Lendlease - The Timberyard Deptford**

Lendlease support cycle lanes in principle and the promotion of active travel modes. However, they are concerned that removing bus lanes would increase bus journey times, congestion and pollution. They have requested further details of the impact assessment done. They also suggest that the cycle lane alignment is parallel with the proposed building lines of their approved masterplan.

They request further detail on the impacts of the proposed changes at Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road junction. This is because their Outline Planning Permission was based on a signal controlled junction and the Convoys Wharf development nearby has an obligation to widen the Oxestalls Road approach to provide additional capacity. They also request more detail on how the proposed mini roundabout would operate, since Oxestalls Road would form the main vehicle route for future residents of the Timberyard development.

The development site has a vehicle access point close to Oxestalls Road junction and Lendlease are concerned that the junction changes would make access harder.

They are also concerned that the proposed changes at Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road junction would increase the risks of accidents, as cyclists may choose to continue straight across the mini roundabout rather than divert on to Oxestalls Road and use the toucan crossing.

They request details of construction timescales as it may impact on the construction of their scheme. They state that they are open to continued engagement.

**4.13.8 Businesses and Business Groups**

**Allies and Morrison**

Allies and Morrison support the overall proposals for CS4.

**Albion Street Group Practice**

Albion Street Practice strongly supports the proposals for CS4 and the segregation of the cycling route. They believe that encouraging active and safe travel would help decrease congestion and pollution as well as improve public health.

They welcome the proposals for the Tooley Street / Tower Bridge Road section and suggest that thought is given to how the Quietway crosses Tower Bridge Road. They are concerned that this section is an area of considerable risk to cyclists, given the cycling fatalities in recent years. They are concerned that the proposals do not show how cyclists can safely access CS4 from its western end and suggest clarity
on access to CS4 from the western end with clear signage. They are concerned that Tower Bridge is dangerous and a disincentive for cyclists to cross the river to/from the North-South Cycle superhighway.

The group is concerned that the Jamaica Road/Bevington Street section crosses a number of side streets. They are also concerned that a high number of HGVs would be using the route during construction works at Chambers Wharf. They suggest that we encourage Tideway to use the river for transport and to employ a banksman to protect cyclists at a single dedicated turn off Jamaica road.

They are concerned at the level of congestion along Jamaica Road, due to traffic trying to access Rotherhithe Tunnel as well the drivers blocking buses by using the gaps between bus lanes and St James Road and Southwark Park Road junctions. They welcome the widening of the pedestrian crossing at Bermondsey station and the banning of southbound traffic on Cathay Street as it would reduce rat running.

The group are very concerned about the current risks to cyclists in the Lower Road area and strongly support the proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout. They believe it would improve access to Brunel Road, reduce congestion and improve air quality in the area as well as improve safety cyclists.

**Bike Boulder Bike**

Strongly support the proposals and reducing the number of vehicles on roads.

**Deli X**

Deli X is concerned about the impact of the proposed banned turns on customer access and deliveries on Deptford High Street.

**F A Albin & Sons Funeral Directors**

F A Albin & Sons Funeral Directors do not support the proposals for CS4. While they support the provision of safe cycle routes across London they are concerned that the existing high levels of pollution and congestion in the area would get worse with the proposals.

They suggest Gomm Road as an alternative route, taking cyclists through Southwark Park and continuing on back roads. They also suggest that London should be for commercial vehicles only at certain times and those with special dispensation.

They suggest that the width restriction at the tunnel should be more strictly enforced, with clear signage on the approaches to minimise closures of the tunnel. They also suggest vehicle recovery facilities should be available at the tunnel.

They support the proposed changes to the road layout at Rotherhithe roundabout and feel it would ease traffic congestion, however, they suggest that any extra capacity created should be for motorists. They also suggest that cyclists need to be educated on road behaviour.
The funeral home expressed concern that access to and from Culling Road onto Lower Road with a hearse or private ambulance is difficult at the moment and that the addition of a cycle lane would make access more difficult.

They are concerned that their journey time has doubled in recent years and that bereaved families are finding it harder to get to them, making funerals longer and more stressful. They are concerned about the future of their business if congestion in the area does not improve.

**Harley’s Flowers**

Harley’s Flowers opposes the banned right turns into Deptford High Street and out of Deptford High Street. They are concerned that motorists would not be able to access local businesses on the high street as before, negatively impacting them. They are concerned that banning the right turns will encourage people to make U-turns and that single lanes will worsen the existing traffic congestion.

**Lai Loi supermarket**

Lai Loi Supermarket are concerned that the impacts on deliveries and customer access for businesses on the high street have not been considered. They are concerned that customers and big lorries will have difficulty accessing the supermarket in Deptford High Street by car from Evelyn Street. They support a cycle lane but are concerned about the island that blocks motorists coming into Deptford High Street from Surrey Quays, and also going right from Deptford High Street to Greenwich. They suggest a traffic signal at the north end of Deptford High Street instead of blocking vehicle access.

**PrimS Limited**

PrimS strongly support the proposals for CS4. They suggested that motorcycles and scooters should be allowed in bus lanes. The respondent currently rides a motorcycle along the CS4 route but would switch to riding a bicycle if the scheme is implemented. They did express concern about the impact of relocating the westbound bus stop at Evelyn Street / Abinger Grove

**Rose Pharmacy**

Rose Pharmacy has requested unrestricted parking for 20 minutes on Creekside, near the pharmacy premises to allow vulnerable customer to access the pharmacy.

**Team London Bridge & Better Bankside Business Improvement Districts**

Better Bankside and Team London Bridge Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) represent over 1,000 businesses in central London.

They strongly support the overall proposals for CS4 and believe that safe and direct routes would encourage cycling in London. They also support connecting CS4 and Quietway 14. They are concerned that cyclists would have to navigate onward journeys through the busy and unsafe areas of Tower Bridge Road, Tooley Street, Borough High Street and London Bridge without safe cycling infrastructure.
They suggest extending the route to London Bridge and provision for onward cycling trips to the Bankside area and the City. They suggest that CS4 should complement the London Bridge station redevelopment other developments within the London Bridge and Bankside area. They suggest dedicated signals and right of way for cyclists joining the route from Tower Bridge to increase the safety of cyclists.

Team London Bridge and Better Bankside also suggest incorporating sustainable urban drainage and green infrastructure into the designs, providing secure cycle parking at residential locations and other large trip attractors along the route as well as clear signage enabling cyclists to join CS4 route safely and easily.

They suggest that CS4 is linked to the Rotherhithe / Canary Wharf Crossing and requested information on how CS4 will connect to existing or planned cycle routes in the area. They suggest working with Southwark Council to secure two-way cycling on all one-way streets and to identify quiet routes that can help develop a wider and better-connected cycle network.

**Unnamed business on Deptford High Street**

The business is concerned that the banned right turns in to Deptford High Street and out towards Greenwich would have a negative impact on their family business as well as trade on Deptford High Street.
4.14 Petitions and campaigns

Petitions involve people adding their names to either a paper or electronic list, backing the views of the petition organiser.

Campaigns involve people copying text from another individual or group, and submitting this text as all or part of their response.

No petitions were received as part of the CS4 consultation. We have reported the six campaigns identified below.

For copies of the original text for the campaigns listed below, please go to Appendix B.

London Cycling Campaign – 1350 responses
Sustrans – 80 responses
Deptford folk – 15
Shad Thames independent group – 11 responses
Southwark Cyclists – 8 responses
Deptford High Street – 4 responses

4.15 Summary of comments from events

We held seven drop-in sessions and attended two public meetings about CS4 (see Section 2.8.6). The main themes or issues to emerge from these events and meetings were:

- Understanding of the details of the scheme, with attendees requesting clarification of some elements of the proposals
- Motor traffic impacts along the route and surrounding roads
- Potential banned turns and the impacts of them
- Explanation of what benefits there would be to cycling and walking
- Some attendees visited the events to register their opposition

4.16 Social media activity

We publicised the consultation online through the @TfL Twitter feed. Tweets reminded readers of the consultation period, upcoming drop-in sessions, and provided a link to the consultation web page. @TfL has 1.42 million followers.

Campaigns for and against the proposal used social media to promote their own petitions and to highlight their views on the scheme. Twitter users discussed and retweeted views and opinions about the scheme, and some put forward suggested answers to consultation questions.

Facebook pages were used by some people to debate the pros and cons of the scheme.
4.17 Comments on the consultation

2914 (89 per cent) respondents answered the question asking for feedback on the consultation. Below, we report the most significant issues raised.

- Some respondents rated the consultation materials positively, complementing the materials in the leaflet and on the website
- Some respondents said information was missing from the consultation, such as information about the costs as well as benefits to walking and cycling
- There was some dissatisfaction with the consultation publicity, with complaints the consultation not publicised enough
- Some respondents expressed concern that the consultation will be ignored and CS4 approved regardless of feedback
- Some respondents questioned the accuracy of the modelling used to estimate traffic impacts as well as pedestrian and cycling flows
- Some respondents commented that better scaling would have been helpful to show dimensions, especially where cycle lanes are less than 4m in width
- Some respondents complained that using many shades of grey made it difficult to distinguish between the roads, cycle highways and footways
- There were concerns that computer generated images of Jamaica Road in particular was not representative of the true level on congestion in the area. Some respondents also feel that there should be more information on how CS4 connects to rest of the cycling network
- Some respondents called for the questions about each section to be accompanied by details of the plans for each section and the consultation period to be extended due to what they saw as insufficient time to publicise the consultation widely or consider the complex proposals
5. Conclusion and next steps

We received 3,265 direct responses to our consultation, of which 83 per cent supported or strongly supported our proposals. 14 per cent opposed or strongly opposed them, while 3 per cent neither supported nor opposed the proposals.

The consultation generated a wide range of views towards the proposals, which we will continue to review in order to help us determine the best way forward. We will also continue to discuss the potential impacts of the proposals with key stakeholders.

We plan to publish a detailed response to the issues raised during consultation, as well as our next steps, later in 2018.
Appendix A: Detailed analysis of comments

All respondents were invited to answer an open question on the overall proposals and a further nine open questions, covering the different sections of CS4, apart from section 5 (Lower Road). None of the open questions were mandatory. This appendix summarises the detailed issues that were raised by the comments.

For each question, general comments are provided first, followed by the main themes in descending order of frequency. The percentages given are calculated from the 3,265 respondents which includes stakeholders.

Question 2: ‘Do you have any comments on the overall proposals?’

All respondents were invited to comment on the overall proposals. 2,230 of the 3,265 respondents provided comments on the overall proposals for CS4 and the issues raised are shown below. Percentages are calculated from the total number of respondents. Only comments that occurred more than once are included.

General

There were 596 (18 per cent) general comments about the overall proposals.

- 420 (13 per cent) respondents made a general comment in support of the scheme such as “great”
- 60 (2 per cent) respondents said the scheme should be constructed as soon as possible
- 45 (1 per cent) respondents made a general comment opposing the scheme such as “bad idea”
- 34 (<1 per cent) respondents said the scheme should have been built long ago
- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be a Cycle superhighway on A2 / Old Kent Road
- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be more vehicle river crossings to alleviate congestion, including tunnels
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested capacity improvements for motor traffic using Rotherhithe Tunnel
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they had safety concerns using Quietway 1 after dark
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be a Cycle superhighway from New Cross to Victoria
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about how the scheme affects public safety in terms of terrorism
2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support pedestrianisation schemes in general
2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that anti-terrorist security barriers on bridges endanger cyclists
2 (<1 per cent) respondents said that Borough High Street is unsafe for cycling
2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they had safety concerns about the design for cyclists at Lewisham roundabout
2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested making Tower Bridge and Rotherhithe Tunnel one way only

Impact on motorists

897 (27 per cent) respondents commented on the impact they expected our overall proposals to have on motorists and motor traffic. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 213 (7 per cent) respondents said CS4 will worsen existing congestion on the route
- 121 (4 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about existing congestion on Jamaica Road, Rotherhithe Roundabout and the approach
- 72 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the existing congestion on CS4 route
- 64 (2 per cent) respondents said CS4 will worsen congestion on Jamaica Road, Rotherhithe Roundabout and the approach
- 53 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about cyclists’ behaviour and adherence to traffic laws
- 36 (1 per cent) respondents said CS4 will ease congestion
- 28 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about further narrowing of roads
- 23 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cyclists will choose to use the parallel road instead of the segregated lane
- 22 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose segregated cycle tracks in general across London as they cause congestion
- 18 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that CS4 will increase rat running and congestion on side roads
- 17 (<1 per cent) respondents said there was a lack of consideration for drivers / motor vehicles in CS4 design
14 (<1 per cent) respondents said there is a lack of provision for delivery and servicing

13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about Shad Thames becoming one way only

13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose the proposed banned turns from Evelyn Street to Deptford High Street

12 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that congestion caused by CS4 will delay emergency vehicles

11 (<1 per cent) respondents said there was a lack of consideration for motorcycles in CS4 design

11 (<1 per cent) respondents said clear signage and education should be provided to reduce conflict with motorists and cyclists using CS4

11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support one way side streets and banned turns as they will prevent rat running

8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that bus lanes already cause congestion

7 (<1 per cent) respondents said the existing 24 hour bus lane operation was unnecessary

7 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be capacity improvements for motor traffic using Rotherhithe Tunnel

6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that CS4 would worsen congestion in the Deptford area

6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the increasing vehicle traffic in area due to new developments

6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about poor driver behaviour at Rotherhithe roundabout

6 (<1 per cent) respondents said enforcement cameras should be used to deter motorists from speeding / breaking traffic law

6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support banned on-street parking / loading bays on CS4 route

5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that poorly phased traffic lights would increase congestion

4 (<1 per cent) respondents said commercial / trade traffic have no alternative mode of transport
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that banned vehicle
turns on CS4 route would causing more congestion and increased difficulty for
drivers
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said all vehicles should be allowed to use cycle
lanes outside of peak hours
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that congestion would
worsen at Rotherhithe Tunnel when Blackwall Tunnel tolling begins
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said bus lanes should be removed to decrease
congestion
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said we should widen the motor traffic lanes as
well as install cycle tracks
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will remove cyclists
from traffic lanes, reducing congestion
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that CS4 will prioritise
non-local cyclists over local car drivers
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support removing central reservations
to increase road space
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about increased
congestion when Blackwall Tunnel is closed for maintenance
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned Rotherhithe Tunnel will
remain congested unless Limehouse is also examined
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that parking would
cause congestion on Brunel Road
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at Tanner Street
becoming one way
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that there would be rat
running down Prince Street and nearby side roads
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said we should allow the bus lane on the
approach to Rotherhithe Roundabout to be open to all traffic
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said we should filter the side roads to reduce rat
running
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said pedestrian and cycle signalised crossings on
CS4 route should be demand responsive
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support new roundabouts
Scope of scheme

850 (25 per cent) respondents commented on our overall proposals and how it relates to the scope of the scheme. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 243 (7 per cent) respondents said we should ensure that CS4 comes to Lower Road
- 100 (3 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be extended to Woolwich
- 65 (2 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be connected with the East-West and/or North-South Cycle Superhighways
- 47 (1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be connected with the proposed Rotherhithe-Canary Wharf bridge
- 42 (1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be extended into Greenwich town centre/Greenwich Park
- 35 (1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be connected with Quietway 1
- 27 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be extended to London Bridge
- 25 (<1 per cent) respondents said we should ensure that CS4 is connected with wider cycling routes, e.g. Quietways, local cycling network
- 24 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be extended north across Tower Bridge
- 23 (<1 per cent) respondents said that the existing route from Greenwich to Woolwich (A206) is dangerous for cyclists
- 20 (<1 per cent) respondents CS4 should be extended to Lewisham
- 16 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that Tower Bridge is dangerous to cycle over
- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be extended further east/south
- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be extended up to the Greenwich Peninsula
- 12 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the gyratory system on Lower Road is unsafe for cyclists
- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said we should connect CS4 to the Thames Path
- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be extended to Charlton
- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should run along the river/on Thames Path
- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be routed through Southwark Park to avoid Rotherhithe roundabout
- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said Quietway 1 already caters to this route
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should extend further into central London
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said temporary cycling facilities should be provided on Lower Road during consultation on that section
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should provide access to local amenities, i.e. shops, health, leisure, community facilities
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said clear signage should be provided, pointing to connecting cycle routes e.g. Quietway 1
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be extended west from Tower Bridge to Southwark Bridge, Blackfriars Bridge, and/or Waterloo
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be extended to Woolwich in order to encourage cycling from new housing developments
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about cyclist safety at the roundabout under the A102 flyover in Woolwich
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be extended to New Cross
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be connected to Canal Approach link across Evelyn Street
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be connected to Haddo Street
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be extended to Abbey Wood
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be extended to Catford
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be extended to Plumstead
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be a cycling/walking bridge between Rotherhithe and Shadwell
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said the National Cycle Network routes in the area should be upgraded
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be cycling/walking river crossings east of Tower Bridge
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said Southwark Park Road should be used as an alternative route if Lower Road plans fall through
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at the absence of south west London from the Cycle Superhighway network
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about access to / from Rolt Street onto CS4
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be extended along B208 / Norman Road
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be extended to Bexley
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be extended to Bromley
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be extended to Eltham

Principles of CS4 scheme

836 (26 per cent) respondents commented on our overall proposals and how they relate to the principles of the scheme. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 110 (3 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 because it will generally increase cycling in the area, e.g. for shopping, leisure, commuting
• 86 (3 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as they are existing cyclists who use the route and feel that their journeys would improve
• 75 (2 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will encourage more people to cycle to work
• 73 (2 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will encourage less confident / more vulnerable cyclists to use it
• 46 (1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will improve people's health / wellbeing / quality of life
• 44 (1 per cent) respondents said they oppose reallocation of road space to cyclists
• 44 (1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will boost active travel
• 38 (1 per cent) respondents said the existing layout is sufficient for cyclists
• 33 (1 per cent) respondents said cycling as a mode of transport is not suitable for everybody
• 31 (1 per cent) respondents said they oppose investment in CS4
• 27 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose cycle tracks as they are not well used
• 26 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will encourage modal shift from private vehicles to cycling
• 21 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that disabled and older people were not considered in the design for CS4
• 21 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support reallocation of road space to cyclists
• 16 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose CS4 for its negative impact on local residents
• 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said we should invest in public transport instead of CS4
• 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said we should route CS4 through back roads to minimise disruption on main roads
• 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose CS4 as it disproportionately prioritises cycling over other road users
• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as will encourage modal shift from public transport to cycling
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that decreasing capacity for vehicles will not necessarily cause modal shift out of vehicles
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the high cost of CS4 for only negligible benefit to all road users
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said we should invest in improvements for motor traffic instead of CS4
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that CS4 will have negative health effects on local people
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they should invest more in bus services as well as CS4
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said we should upgrade Quietway 1 instead of CS4
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will support population growth in the surrounding area
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that CS4 conflicts with policy of improving and encouraging use of public transport
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that demand for cycling is low within scheme area
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said money should be invested in community facilities, e.g. hospitals, libraries instead of CS4
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested a Cycle Superhighway from New Cross to Victoria
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support pedestrianisation schemes like Oxford Street
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said that cycling does not improve health
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that Cycle Superhighways do not make cycling any safer in principle
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be funded by cyclists who will use it
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 will reduce overcrowding on trains from Greenwich to the City
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cyclist safety is prioritised at the expense of the efficiency of roads
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said cyclists should use public transport instead, e.g. one of many near-empty buses
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said we should invest in pedestrian footways instead of CS4
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said mobility scooters should be allowed to use CS4
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said only minor improvements are needed to the existing layout, requiring much less expense
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support the Healthy Streets approach
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said Cycle Superhighways should be renamed

Impacts on safety

726 (22 per cent) respondents commented on the impact they expected our overall proposals to have on the safety of road users. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 344 (11 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will be safer for cyclists than the current road layout
• 136 (4 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the existing layout is dangerous for cycling
• 35 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the existing congestion makes cycling dangerous
• 23 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the existing design of Rotherhithe roundabout is unsafe for cycling
• 23 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the existing route from Greenwich to Woolwich (A206) is dangerous for cyclists
• 22 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the existing roads in South East London are unsafe
• 20 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support segregated cycle lanes in principle due to improved safety
• 17 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that poor driver behaviour makes cycling the current route dangerous / unpleasant
• 15 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the quality of the existing road surface
• 15 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the road users are unfamiliar with two way cycle tracks
• 15 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that CS4 will not improve safety for cyclists
• 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that two way cycle tracks are unsafe for cyclists
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at the lack of speed limits within segregated cycle tracks
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the impact on cycling safety of the increase in HGVs due to nearby developments
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that poor cyclists’ behaviour endangers their own safety
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about cyclist safety at the roundabout under the A102 flyover
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at the proximity of CS4 and associated traffic to many schools and playgrounds
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the slippery surface on Cycle Superhighways
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the pinch point from Surrey Canal Bridge near Oxestalls Road
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about cyclists wearing headphones
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will be safer for motorists than current layout

**Impact on cycling**

591 (18 per cent) respondents commented on the impact they expected our overall proposals to have on cycling. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 196 (6 per cent) respondents said they support segregated cycle tracks on CS4
• 54 (2 per cent) respondents said they support more segregated cycling infrastructure in London

• 36 (1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 for improving active travel options in south / south east London

• 28 (1 per cent) respondents said cycle tracks should be designed to handle large volumes of cycles, including future growth

• 24 (1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be continuous / uninterrupted for cyclists

• 24 (1 per cent) respondents said there should be one way cycle tracks on both sides of road instead of two way cycle track

• 18 (1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that cycle lanes are only used at peak times

• 18 (1 per cent) respondents said they oppose segregated cycle tracks on CS4 route

• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about joining or leaving segregated cycle track from opposite side roads

• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that cycle-only traffic lights cause cycling congestion with long red-light time, dissuading cyclists from using segregated cycle lanes

• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the integration of CS4 with continued highway at Tower Bridge

• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it allows for quicker cycling journeys than Quietways or other less direct routes

• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that faster cyclists impatiently pressure / dangerously overtake slower cyclists inside segregated tracks

• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose more segregated cycling infrastructure in London

• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the width of the cycle track

• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about motorist behaviour and adherence to traffic laws

• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said that south / south east London is too vehicle-centric
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support cycle track priority over side roads

• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about changing cycle track from north to south (at Southwark Park Road)

• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support cyclist-only traffic lights

• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose the removal of the central dividing line separating opposing traffic directions

• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said the CS4 route should be well lit at all times

• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the CS4 design on Evelyn Street

• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the integration with the highway at end of the route (Creek Road)

• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that pedestrians do not pay enough attention when crossing segregated cycle lanes

• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support bus stop bypasses

• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said cycle-only traffic lights should allocate favourable green-light time to cyclists

• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 design on Jamaica Road

• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that cycle tracks will be slower than using existing bus lanes

• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said underground tunnels should be built for cyclists

• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said contraflow tracks should be provided for cyclists on one way side roads accessing CS4

• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested markings or tactile paving to warn cyclists of upcoming crossings / bus stops

• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said Quietway 1 is better designed than CS4

• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said traffic lights should be re phased to create "green wave" effect

• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should use high quality tarmac to benefit skateboards & push-scooters

• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned cycle lanes are on footways rather than road
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be different height of cycle lanes and roads at junctions

• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said cycle tracks should be well maintained e.g. access for road sweepers, leaves removed

• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support consideration of disabled cyclists in CS4 proposals

• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be extended down Deptford Church Street to Quietway 1

**Impact on pedestrians**

302 (9 per cent) respondents commented on the impact they expected our overall proposals to have on pedestrians. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 69 (2 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the impact of poor cyclist behaviour on pedestrians, e.g. cycling on footway, not stopping at zebra crossings, going through red lights

• 41 (1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will be safer for pedestrians than current road layout

• 40 (1 per cent) respondents said CS4 would increase cyclist / pedestrian conflict

• 31 (1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the potential for pedestrian / cyclist conflict at bus stop bypasses

• 20 (1 per cent) respondents said CS4 would have a negative impact on pedestrians

• 18 (1 per cent) respondents said they support the new pedestrian crossings and walkways on CS4 route

• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said pedestrian footways should be wider

• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that pedestrians are not aware they should look both ways when crossing segregated Cycle Superhighways

• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose staggered pedestrian crossings on CS4 route

• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be clear signage to avoid conflict with pedestrians

• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the potential for conflict at bus stop bypasses with vulnerable users

• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 will reduce footway space
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said barriers should be put on CS4 route to prevent pedestrians crossing them without due care and attention
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said more time should be allowed for pedestrians crossing the road on CS4 route
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said traffic light-controlled pedestrian crossings should be used at Rotherhithe Roundabout
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it would reduce the number of cyclists using Greenwich Foot Tunnel to reach the City
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 priority over side roads should be extended to give pedestrian footway priority too
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said all cycle lanes should be painted a different colour to footways in order to signal a change of use to pedestrians
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the pedestrian crossings being moved further away from bus stops
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose any use of shared footways
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said pedestrian crossing should be elevated at Rotherhithe Roundabout
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be more north - south pedestrian crossings on Evelyn Street
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be more pedestrian crossings on Jamaica Road

Environmental impacts

275 (8 per cent) respondents commented on the impact they expected our overall proposals to have on the environment. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 86 (3 per cent) respondents said CS4 will worsen existing pollution on the route
• 83 (3 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will help reduce air / noise pollution and / or provide other environmental benefits
• 30 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at the existing level of pollution on CS4 route
• 22 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about congestion and delays during the construction phase
• 21 (1 per cent) respondents said they support proposed improvements to the urban realm / green spaces
• 12 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be increased provision of green infrastructure / trees with CS4
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the removal of trees from the CS4 route
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about simultaneous disruption from CS4 and new developments
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be more improvements to the public realm
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that quality monitors should installed in public spaces
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be additional measures to reduce noise pollution, especially from motorcycles
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be measures to reduce pollution from commercial HGVs
• 2 (1 per cent) respondents said more should be done to improve air quality

Impact on bus users

219 (7 per cent) respondents commented on the impact they expected our overall proposals to have on bus users. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 70 (2 per cent) respondents said CS4 will cause bus delays
• 58 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the impact of removing bus lanes, especially on Jamaica Road and Evelyn Street
• 15 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that existing congestion delays buses
• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said the road layout should be designed to ensure traffic does not block access to bus lanes
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support the changes to Rotherhithe Roundabout as it will resolve traffic queueing for the tunnel blocking buses
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be more yellow box junctions on CS4 route to stop buses being blocked by congestion
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 should be routed on back roads to avoid removing bus lanes on main roads
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose proposed moving of bus stops
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said bus priority along the entire CS4 route should be improved
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support the bus gate at Rotherhithe Roundabout
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support bus lanes being extended to the edge of junctions
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that vehicles ignore bus lane restrictions, delaying buses
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the removal of eastbound bus lane at Abbey Street junction with Jamaica Road
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose moving Abinger Grove bus stop
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose the removal of bus stop close to Oxestalls Road
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said bus stops should be rationalised

Comments on Policy
180 (5 per cent) respondents commented on our overall proposals and how it relates to the policy of the scheme. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 34 (1 per cent) respondents said cyclists should have a licence and/or insurance
• 16 (1 per cent) respondents said cyclists do not make a contribution to the funding of roads
• 15 (1 per cent) respondents said cyclists should pay "road tax"
• 15 (1 per cent) respondents said active and public transport options in south/south east London should be improved
• 15 (1 per cent) respondents said there should be increased policing of cyclist behaviour and enforcing cycling traffic laws
• 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be measures to reduce car use
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said cycle training should be provided to improve cyclist behaviour and respect of traffic laws
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be flexible cycle lanes / shared use of road space managed according to demand at different times of day
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said cycle lanes should be made mandatory for cyclists to use
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be public transport improvements
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said wearing helmets should be mandatory for cyclists
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose banning motorcycles from bus lanes
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said we should integrate better with other TfL and local council schemes
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said we should ban all cars due to the negative impact on health, safety, and congestion
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be better policing of vehicles illegally driving / parking in cycle lanes
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said we should make Tower Bridge and Rotherhithe Tunnel one way only
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said walking rather than cycling should be encouraged
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said cycling should be elevated to the highest priority mode of transport
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said road charging / Congestion Charge should be implemented in the area
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said yellow box junctions and strict enforcement should be used to ensure traffic doesn't block cycle lanes
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said cyclists should be required to wear reflective clothing

Comments on changes to junctions
170 (5 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for the junctions on the route. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 20 (1 per cent) respondents said they support the design for cyclists at Rotherhithe Roundabout
• 20 (1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the plans for cyclists at Oxestalls Road mini roundabout
• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose a banned left turn at the junction of Jamaica Road / Bevington Street
• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said Oxestalls Road junction should remain controlled by traffic lights
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about conflict between vehicles and cyclists where CS4 has priority over side roads
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the plans for cyclists at Rotherhithe Roundabout
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be a direct lane bypassing Rotherhithe Roundabout to access Brunel Road from eastbound Jamaica Road
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said the design at Jamaica Road / Southwark Park Road junction is poor
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be traffic light control at Rotherhithe Roundabout
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about congestion at Rotherhithe Roundabout blocking traffic turning into Brunel Road
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about cyclist access to / from Brunel Road from Rotherhithe Roundabout
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said the proposal for Jamaica Road / St James' Road junction is unsafe
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose toucan crossing at Oxestalls Road
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about motorists ignoring banned right turns at Deptford High Street / Evelyn Street intersection
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support a dedicated left turn lane into Brunel Road
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned the removal of advanced stop box at Tooley Street / Tower Bridge Road junction would affect cyclists safety
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about cyclist safety at McMillan Street junction
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the narrowing width of traffic lanes at junctions
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said segregated cycle tracks over-complicate navigating junctions for cyclists
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that drivers will not respect Oxestalls Road mini roundabout - Evelyn Street will take priority
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said the existing layout of Creek Road / Deptford Church Street is dangerous for cyclists
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose all toucan crossings since cyclists deliberately circumvent them
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said Tanner Street bus stop should be moved west on Tooley Street to reduce congestion at junction
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said Rotherhithe Roundabout should be removed
Suggestions on complementary measures to CS4

108 (3.3 per cent) respondents made suggestions on measures to complement CS4. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 47 (1 per cent) respondents suggested that cycle hire bikes should be implemented along the CS4 route
- 23 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested further measures to relief traffic congestion on the CS4 route
- 12 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested provision of improved / secure cycle parking
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support the Rotherhithe - Canary Wharf cycling / walking bridge
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested implementing a 20mph speed limit
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested a traffic demand management strategy for roads along the CS4
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested a toll on Rotherhithe Tunnel to reduce traffic
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested improving the capacity and safety of the Thames Path
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested maintaining Quietway 1 as a complementary route to CS4
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested incentivising modal shift to powered two wheelers in order to reduce road congestion
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested removing guardrails preventing pedestrians from crossing roads
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested separate bays for deliveries and disabled users
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested implementing traffic reducing measures in Greenwich town centre

Economic impacts

54 respondents (1.7 per cent) commented on the impact they expected our overall proposals to have on the local economy. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 15 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that CS4 will damage local business
- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said that CS4 will contribute to the regeneration of the surrounding areas such as Deptford and Surrey Quays
7 (<1 per cent) respondents said that they support CS4 as it will cater for increased demand from new housing developments on the route

5 (<1 per cent) respondents said that they support CS4 as it will improve connectivity along the route, e.g. between Deptford and Rotherhithe

5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the impact of banned turns at Deptford High Street on local businesses

4 (<1 per cent) respondents said that they support CS4 as people using bikes will save time and money

3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about businesses having less car parking

**Question 3: ‘Do you have any comments on the proposals for Tooley Street / Tower Bridge Road?’**

**Non-specific comments**

49 (2 per cent) respondents provided a non-specific general comment on the Tooley Street / Tower Bridge Road proposals:

- 33 (1 per cent) respondents provided a non-specific positive comment such as "great"
- 16 (<1 per cent) respondents provided a non-specific negative comment such as "terrible"

**Impact on safety**

277 (7 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Tooley Street / Tower Bridge Road to impact safety:

- 73 (2 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the safety of cyclists using bus lanes
- 47 (1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will be safer for cyclists than current road layout
- 34 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the existing layout is dangerous for cycling
- 32 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about cyclists' safety due to vehicles crossing cycle tracks
- 18 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the potential for conflict between cyclists and other road users
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested clear signage for car users to give way to cycle track users
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested lower speed limits should be implemented for motor traffic to improve cycle safety
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about pedestrians and cyclists’ safety from speeding vehicles
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support the safer road layout for eastbound cyclists on Tooley Street at Tanner Street junction
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will be safer for all road users

Impact on cycling

176 (5 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Tooley Street / Tower Bridge Road to affect cycling. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 69 (2 per cent) respondents said they support segregated cycle tracks on CS4
• 19 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cycle track is not wide enough
• 18 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested filtering vehicle access on side and back roads to reduce traffic volumes
• 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support cyclist priority across side roads
• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that existing congestion makes cycling dangerous or difficult
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they have concerns about cyclists’ connection between Shad Thames, Tooley Street and Tanner Street
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about two way cycle tracks
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about adequate signal timings for cyclists to pass
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the cycle track switching from north to south
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about joining or leaving segregated cycle track
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the lack of cycle-only stages on crossings
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested improving sightlines from Shad Thames when turning right onto Tooley Street for cyclists
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested installing signage to encourage cyclists to use other roads and avoid Tower Bridge Road
Impact on motorists

80 (3 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Tooley Street / Tower Bridge Road to affect motorists. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 36 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that CS4 will worsen existing congestion on the route
- 22 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the existing level of congestion in the area
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about access / egress from Shad Thames
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they opposed reallocation of road space to cyclists
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the impact of narrowing road lanes for motor traffic
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said there is a lack of consideration for drivers / motor vehicles in CS4 design
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that single a traffic lane will cause congestion for cars and buses turning into Tower Bridge Road, especially when the bridge is lifted

Scope of scheme

78 (2 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for Tooley Street / Tower Bridge Road and how it relates to the scope of the scheme. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 22 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested extending CS4 to London Bridge
- 19 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested connecting CS4 with East / West and North / South Cycle Superhighways
- 18 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested extending CS4 over Tower Bridge north of the river
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested extending CS4 to Woolwich
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested connecting CS4 to Quietway 14
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said we should ensure CS4 comes to Lower Road
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested connecting CS4 with Blackfriars Bridge and Southwark Bridge Road
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested pedestrianizing Tooley Street
Principles of CS4 scheme

72 (2 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for Tooley Street / Tower Bridge Road and how they relate to the principles of the scheme:

- 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they opposed prioritising cyclists over other road users
- 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said that the existing layout is sufficient for cyclists
- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will encourage less confident cyclists to use it
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they opposed making Shad Thames one way northbound
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as will encourage modal shift from private vehicles to cycling
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that making Shad Thames one way will encourage poor driver behaviour
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support making Shad Thames one way northbound
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that there is not enough space for the proposed cycle tracks
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the potential impact on local residents
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said that cycling as a mode of transport is not suitable for everybody
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that demand for cycling is low within scheme area
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested routing CS4 on back roads

Impact on pedestrians

55 (2 per cent) respondents commented on the impact they expected our proposals for Tooley Street / Tower Bridge Road to have on pedestrians:

- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that CS4 would have a negative impact on pedestrians
- 12 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support new pedestrian crossings and footways
- 11 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the cycle track is clearly marked to reduce chance of pedestrians entering it by mistake
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the impact of poor cyclist behaviour on pedestrian safety, such as cycling on the footway, not stopping at zebra crossings, or going through red lights
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about cyclist / pedestrian conflict when using segregated cycle tracks
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the risk to pedestrians from two way cycle tracks
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about safety as this area has high pedestrian volumes
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about pedestrian safety where Tooley Street meets Tower Bridge Road

Comments on changes to junctions
46 (1 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for the junctions on this section:

• 35 (1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about cyclists’ safety when turning into and out of Tower Bridge Road
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that junctions should be designed to avoid conflicts between users
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about traffic light stagings where Tanner Street meets Tooley Street

Impact on bus users
23 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact they expected our proposals for Tooley Street / Tower Bridge Road to have on bus users:

• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that CS4 will increase bus waiting times and bus journey times
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about delays to eastbound buses entering Tooley Street due to reduction in eastbound traffic lanes
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the impact of removing the eastbound bus lane
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested improving signage / enforcement to reduce general traffic blocking bus lanes
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the difficulty for buses to continue straight on to Tooley Street due to Dockhead bus stop relocation
Environmental impacts
19 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact they expected our proposals for Tooley Street / Tower Bridge Road to have on the environment:

- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned at the existing level of pollution on the CS4 route
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that CS4 would make pollution in the area worse
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the potential increase in congestion and delays during construction phase

Economic impacts
There were 12 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the expected economic impact of our proposals for Tooley Street / Tower Bridge Road:

- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned the impact CS4 would have on businesses based along the route
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they opposed investment in CS4
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said the scheme was a waste of public money

Question 4: ‘Do you have any comments on the proposals for Jamaica Road / Bevington Street?’

Non-specific comments
35 (<1 per cent) respondents provided non-specific comments on the proposals for Jamaica Road / Bevington Street:

- 25 (<1 per cent) respondents provided a non-specific positive comment such as “I support this”
- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents provided a non-specific negative comment such as “bad idea”

Impact on motorists
85 (3 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Jamaica Road / Bevington Street to affect motorists. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 30 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the existing congestion on the CS4 route
- 29 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that CS4 will worsen the existing congestion on the route
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about drivers having to cross cycle tracks to access side roads
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the existing congestion caused by bus lanes along Jamaica Road, leading to Rotherhithe tunnel
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will improve congestion
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the impact of lane reduction for eastbound traffic on Jamaica Road near Bevington Street
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that congestion caused by CS4 will delay emergency vehicles

Impact on safety
81 (3 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Jamaica Road / Bevington Street to affect safety. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 21 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will be safer for cyclists than the current road layout
• 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the existing layout is dangerous for cycling
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the risk of conflict between cyclists and other road users
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they had concerns about the safety of cyclists using bus lanes
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about vehicles speeding on side roads to avoid traffic
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested "Give Way" signage or other measures to clarify cyclist priority at George Row
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about cyclists' safety from vehicles crossing cycle tracks
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested lower speed limits for motor traffic to improve cycle safety
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested clear signage for car users to give way to cycle track users
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about cyclists' safety due to increased HGVs during super sewer works at Chambers Wharf
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said that poor driver behaviour makes cycling along the existing route dangerous / unpleasant
Impact on pedestrians

55 (2 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Jamaica Road / Bevington Street to affect pedestrians. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 15 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about cyclist behaviour when interacting with pedestrians
- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about staggered crossings for pedestrians, especially those with buggies, wheelchairs or children
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the safety of children at neighbouring schools
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported new pedestrian crossings and walkways
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that the CS4 proposals will make it harder for pedestrians to cross the route
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the impact of poor cyclist behaviour on pedestrians, e.g. cycling on footway, not stopping at zebra crossings, going through red lights
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents called for clear signage to mark cycle track for pedestrians
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for pedestrian priority to be maintained

Impact on cycling

52 (2 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Jamaica Road / Bevington Street to affect cycling. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they supported segregated cycle tracks
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support cycle track priority over side roads
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the safety of two way cycle tracks
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested filtering vehicle access on side and back roads to reduce traffic volumes
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents called for adequate signal timings for cyclists to pass
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about safely joining or leaving segregated cycle track from side roads
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the safety of the curve in the cycle track at George Row
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the cycle track switching from north to south
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about safely joining or leaving segregated cycle track from Marine Street

Principles of the scheme

47 (2 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for Jamaica Road / Bevington Street and how they relate to the principles of the scheme:

• 12 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the impact of CS4 on local residents
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed prioritising cyclists over other road users
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested using back roads for cyclists as an alternative
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that there is not enough space for the proposed cycle tracks
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said the existing layout is sufficient for cyclists
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents supported CS4 as it prioritises active travel
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that decreasing vehicle capacity will not necessarily cause modal shift out of vehicles
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed CS4 as cycle tracks are underused
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents supported CS4 as it would encourage less confident cyclists to use it

Comments on changes to junctions

42 (1 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for the junctions on this section. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about cyclists’ safety when turning into and out of St James’ Road
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about cyclists’ safety when turning into and out of Abbey Street
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the impact of banning left turns into Bevington Street
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed banned left turns into Bevington Street as there are few other options and it would increase traffic on Mill Street
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support the cycle track bypassing Abbey Street signalised junction
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support banning left turns into Bevington Street as it will stop vehicles blocking bus lanes
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested retaining the yellow box markings at Jamaica Road / Bevington Street / St James' Road junction

Impact on bus users
26 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Jamaica Road / Bevington Street to bus users:
• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said that CS4 will cause bus delays
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents expressed concern about cars blocking bus lanes
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the removal of bus lanes approaching Abbey Street
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents supported extending the bus lane on Jamaica Road to the St James' Road junction
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested yellow box markings between bus lanes at junctions like St James' Road and Bevington Street to avoid cars blocking them
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents support CS4 as buses won’t be slowed down by cyclists

Environmental impacts
14 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact they expected our proposals for Jamaica Road / Bevington Street to have on the environment:
• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that CS4 would make pollution in the area worse
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the potential increase in congestion and delays during construction phase
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the survival of trees during the relocation
Question 5: ‘Do you have any comments on the proposals for Jamaica Road / Southwark Park Road?’

517 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Jamaica Road / Southwark Park Road and the issues raised are shown below. Percentages are calculated from the total number of respondents.

Non-specific comments

23 (<1 per cent) respondents provided non-specific comments on the proposals for Jamaica Road / Southwark Park Road:

- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents made a non-specific positive comment such as “great”
- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents made a non-specific negative comment such as “pointless”

Impact on motorists

107 (3 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Jamaica Road / Southwark Park Road to affect motorists. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 27 (<1 per cent) respondents said the proposals would worsen the existing congestion on the CS4 route
- 23 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the existing congestion on the CS4 route
- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that cyclists might use the highway instead of the two way cycle track
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they opposed reallocation of road space to cyclists
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about congestion from Rotherhithe Tunnel
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that the cycle track switching from north to south will increase traffic congestion
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support making Cathay Street one way northbound as it would prevent rat running
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the impact of changes in Marigold Street on local residents
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested widening the roads for motor traffic
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said congestion in the area is caused by eastbound 188 and 47 buses on the approach to Rotherhithe Roundabout
2 (<1 per cent) respondents said existing congestion in the area is caused by 24 hour bus lanes

2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that the new pedestrian crossing at Bermondsey station will cause a pinch point for congestion

2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the proposed cycle track switch is relocated to align with existing pedestrian crossings, minimising impact on motor traffic

**Impact on cycling**

103 (3 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Jamaica Road / Southwark Park Road to affect cycling. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 39 (1 per cent) respondents expressed concern that the cycle track changing from north to south would increase waiting times for cyclists
- 12 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support segregated cycle tracks on CS4
- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested filtering vehicle access on side and back roads to reduce traffic volumes
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said existing congestion makes cycling dangerous
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about safety when joining or leaving segregated cycle track from side roads
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the cycle track stays on one side of the road
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support cycle track priority over side roads
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested contraflow for cyclists on one way side roads accessing CS4
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested one way cycle tracks on both sides of road instead of two way cycle track
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said that the existing layout is sufficient for cyclists
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the suitability of Rotherhithe tunnel for cyclists
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that cyclists' waiting area at crossover of cycle track at Southwark Park Road is insufficient
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support reallocation of road space to cyclists

Comments on changes to junctions
69 (2 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for the junctions on this section. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 49 (2 per cent) respondents called for improvements to junction of Jamaica Road / Southwark Park Road to benefit cycle safety
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about safety when joining or leaving segregated cycle track from Southwark Park Road
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents called for a yellow box at Southwark Park Road junction to ensure cars do not block the cycling crossing
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about safety when joining or leaving segregated cycle track from West Lane
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about safety when joining or leaving segregated cycle track from Drummond Road

Impact on safety
65 (2 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Jamaica Road / Southwark Park Road to affect safety. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 21 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about cyclists’ safety from vehicles crossing cycle tracks
• 17 (<1 per cent) respondents said the existing layout is dangerous for cycling
• 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will be safer for cyclists than current road layout
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about road safety from drivers rat running around Southwark Park Road
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said that the existing layout is dangerous for pedestrians
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the risk of cyclist motorist conflict

Impact on pedestrians
51 (2 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Jamaica Road / Southwark Park Road to affect pedestrians:

• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support new pedestrian crossings and walkways
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support the new pedestrian crossing in front of Bermondsey station
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that CS4 proposals will make it harder for pedestrians to cross the route
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned there would be long waiting times for pedestrians due to traffic light phasing
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the impact of poor cyclist behaviour on pedestrians, e.g. cycling on footway, not stopping at zebra crossings, going through red lights
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents expressed concern about the convenience of pedestrian crossing at West Lane
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents expressed concern that reduced footway width will increase pedestrian congestion
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents expressed concern for the safety of children at neighbouring schools
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for zebra crossings at bus stop bypasses
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the risk of pedestrian / cyclist conflict at bus stop bypasses

**Impact on bus users**

36 (1 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Jamaica Road / Southwark Park Road to affect bus users. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said that CS4 will cause bus delays
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support making Cathay Street one way northbound to stop rat running traffic blocking the bus lane
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents expressed concern about cars blocking bus lanes
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the removal of bus lanes
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support bus lane extension after West lane junction to stop traffic blocking the bus lane

**Principles of the scheme**

32 (1 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for Jamaica Road / Southwark Park Road and how they relate to the principles of the scheme:
• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said the scheme was not properly thought out
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed prioritising cyclists over other road users
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested routing CS4 on back roads to minimise disruption on main roads
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said demand for cycling is low within scheme area
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents supported CS4 as it improves connectivity in the area
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents supported prioritising pedestrians over motorists at crossings

Environmental impacts
13 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact they expected our proposals for Jamaica Road / Southwark Park Road to have on the environment:
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the existing level of pollution in the area
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the about trees along the route being preserved
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the potential increase in congestion and delays during construction phase

Scope of scheme
13 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for Jamaica Road / Southwark Park Road and how it relates to the scope of the scheme.
• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested routing CS4 through Southwark Park to avoid Rotherhithe roundabout
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents called for cycle hire bikes to be implemented along the route

Question 6: ‘Do you have any comments on the proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout?’
731 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout and the issues raised are shown below. Percentages are calculated from the total number of respondents.
Impact on safety

294 (9 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout to affect safety. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 123 (4 per cent) respondents expressed concern that the existing layout of Rotherhithe Roundabout is dangerous for cycling
- 49 (2 per cent) respondents said they support improvements at Rotherhithe Roundabout as it will be safer for cycling than the current road layout
- 18 (1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about driver behaviour at proposed parallel cycle / pedestrian crossings
- 18 (1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the safety of the proposed parallel pedestrian / cycle crossings over two-lane road
- 17 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the potential risk of cyclist / pedestrian conflict at parallel crossings
- 15 (<1 per cent) respondents called for clear signage to help drivers and cyclists negotiate proposed parallel pedestrian and cycle crossing
- 13 (<1 per cent) respondents said poor driver behaviour makes Rotherhithe roundabout dangerous / unpleasant
- 11 (<1 per cent) respondents called for signalised crossings instead of the proposed parallel pedestrian / cycle crossings
- 12 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support the proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout as it will be safer for road users than the current road layout
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 will not improve safety for cyclists
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that there should be clear priority for cyclists and pedestrians over motor traffic at proposed parallel cycle / pedestrian crossings
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for priority for pedestrians over cyclists
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said the proposed parallel pedestrian / cycle crossings should cross one lane rather than two

Impact on motorists

213 (7 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout to affect motorists. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:
• 79 (2 per cent) respondents said that they are concerned about the existing congestion at Rotherhithe Roundabout and the approach
• 43 (1 per cent) respondents said the proposals worsen the existing congestion
• 19 (1 per cent) respondents called for further improvements to traffic flow
• 16 (<1 per cent) respondents expressed concern about drivers using the lane intended for Brunel Road traffic to access Rotherhithe tunnel
• 12 (<1 per cent) respondents support the dedicated left turn traffic lane into Brunel Road
• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the reallocation of road space to cyclists
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support the additional entry lane into Rotherhithe tunnel
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will reduce congestion
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents called for a physical barrier between Rotherhithe tunnel and Brunel Road traffic lanes to prevent lane changing
• 3 (<1 per cent) said the proposals do not improve motor vehicle access to Rotherhithe peninsula
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support any proposed improvements to traffic flow

Impact on cycling
103 (3 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout to affect cycling. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 41 (1 per cent) respondents said they support segregated cycle tracks at Rotherhithe Roundabout
• 17 (<1 per cent) respondents said existing congestion makes cycling dangerous at Rotherhithe Roundabout
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about safe transition as cyclists rejoin the highway from Brunel Road
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that too many crossings are proposed for cyclists at Rotherhithe Roundabout
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support proposed improved lane to Brunel Road
4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested improved access for cyclists at Southwark Park

3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about cycle congestion at Rotherhithe Roundabout once CS4 is implemented

3 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be one way cycle tracks on both sides of road instead of two way cycle track

3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that traffic light phasing should give priority to cyclists at Rotherhithe Roundabout

2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that drivers will block parallel pedestrian and cycle crossings

2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that cyclists would use the highway instead of the two way cycle track

2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that cycle tracks are designed to handle large volumes of cycles, including future growth

2 (<1 per cent) respondents said the Rotherhithe Roundabout improvements will reduce the number of people using Southwark Park

**Principles of the scheme**

89 (3 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout and how they relate to the principles of the scheme:

- 69 (2 per cent) respondents said they support the proposals as it allows cyclists to bypass Rotherhithe Roundabout

- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said the proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout are not significant / ambitious enough

- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will generally increase cycling in the area and link Greenwich to the City for shopping, leisure and commuting

- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said disabled and older people were not considered in the design

- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will encourage less confident cyclists to use it, including children, families and elderly

- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose investment in CS4

**Comments on changes to junctions**

65 (2 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for the junctions on this section. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:
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• 20 (<1 per cent) respondents called for signalised traffic control at Rotherhithe Roundabout
• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents called for more enforcement of keep clear restrictions / lane use at Rotherhithe Roundabout
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the abuse of keep clear restrictions at Rotherhithe roundabout
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested a direct lane to access Brunel Road from eastbound Jamaica Road at Rotherhithe Roundabout
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents called for improvements to the keep clear / yellow box restrictions at Rotherhithe Roundabout
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents called for the removal of Rotherhithe Roundabout altogether
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for a review of restrictions at Rotherhithe Roundabout (for example, allowing motorists to use bus lanes)

Scope of scheme
65 (2 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout and how it relates to the scope of the scheme. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 13 (<1 per cent) respondents expressed concern that the scheme ends after Rotherhithe roundabout / no proposals for Lower Road
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents complained that it was difficult to see what changes are proposed in the consultation materials
• 8 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that CS4 route connects with proposed Rotherhithe - Canary Wharf bridge
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested a flyover / underpass for motor traffic at Rotherhithe Roundabout
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested routing CS4 through Southwark Park to avoid Rotherhithe Roundabout
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested building a bridge to cross the river from Rotherhithe Roundabout
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested building a second Rotherhithe tunnel to increase motor traffic capacity
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested a Dutch-style roundabout design with cyclist priority
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested a pedestrian / cycle bridge / flyover over Rotherhithe Roundabout
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested toll / road pricing for Rotherhithe tunnel to reduce traffic levels
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said that the proposed link between Brunel Road / Jamaica Road for cyclists is unclear
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested elevated roundabout such as Hovenring in the Netherlands / grade separation of cycle route
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested CS4 connects to Rotherhithe village via two way link on Marychurch Road

Environmental impacts
30 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact they expected our proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout to have on the environment. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the existing level of pollution at Rotherhithe Roundabout
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said Rotherhithe Roundabout is too big / blights the area / causes severance
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents called for more trees / greenery / public art at Rotherhithe Roundabout
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 will worsen existing pollution on the route
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the removal of trees at Rotherhithe Roundabout

Impact on bus users
30 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout to affect bus users. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support the bus gate proposal at Rotherhithe Roundabout
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support the proposals for Rotherhithe roundabout as it will relieve congestion for eastbound buses
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 will cause bus delays
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents expressed concern about existing delays to buses at Rotherhithe Roundabout
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents expressed concern about the proposed removal of bus lane at Rotherhithe Roundabout
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed 24 hour bus lane
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that eastbound bus lane on Jamaica Road ends sooner to allow motorists to make left turn into Brunel Road

Impact on pedestrians
20 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout to affect pedestrians:

• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support new pedestrian crossing improvements
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents called for zebra crossing over CS4 segregated cycle track at Rotherhithe Roundabout
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents called for the introduction and enforcement of 20mph limit
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about how bus stop bypasses would affect disabled users

Question 7: ‘Do you have any comments on the proposals for Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road?’

455 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road and the issues raised are shown below. Percentages are calculated from the total number of respondents.

Non-specific comments:
23 (<1 per cent) respondents provided non-specific comments on the proposals for Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road:

• 14 (<1 per cent) respondents made a non-specific positive comment such as “great”
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents made a non-specific negative comment such as “pointless”

Comments on changes to junctions
301 (9 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for the Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road junction. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 65 (2 per cent) respondents said the proposed toucan crossing at Oxestalls Road is inconvenient for cyclists
• 39 (1 per cent) respondents called for a signalised junction at Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road
• 25 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned that cyclists will use highway rather than toucan at junction of Oxestalls Road / Evelyn Street
• 25 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose mini roundabout at Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road
• 24 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested a more direct crossing / priority for cyclists at the junction of Oxestalls Road / Evelyn Street
• 19 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested filtering of Oxestalls Road to prevent through motor traffic
• 18 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested a T-junction at Oxestalls Road / Evelyn Street junction
• 17 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are not sure the mini roundabout at Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road is the right solution
• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that the toucan crossing of Oxestalls Road will not cope with the high volume of cyclists
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that the proposed toucan crossing of Oxestalls Road is not ideal for pedestrians
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that CS4 should give cyclists priority through the Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road junction
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents called for parallel crossings for cyclists / pedestrians at the Oxestalls Road / Evelyn Street junction
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested banning vehicles from turning left into Oxestalls Road from Evelyn Street
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that Oxestalls Road / Evelyn Street junction is unsuitable for tricycles or adapted bikes
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the petrol station exit near the Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road junction is designed to ensure space for vehicles to give way and high visibility of cyclists
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support a mini roundabout at Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said there should be an entry point to CS4 for cyclists joining from Grinstead Road
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for improved signage / road markings to remind drivers to give way to cyclists at side road crossings
Impact on safety

83 (3 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road to affect safety. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 28 (1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the collision risk of mixing school children and cyclists at Oxestalls Road toucan crossing
- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the potential risk of cyclist / pedestrian conflict at the shared crossing of Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road junction
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the risk of drivers not respecting the mini roundabout
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said the existing layout of Evelyn Street is dangerous for cycling
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the potential risk of conflict between cyclists travelling in opposite directions at the toucan crossing of Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road junction
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said the existing road surface quality is poor
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about cyclists taking the corner into Oxestalls Road at speed
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about aggressive cycling and risk of collisions with pedestrians
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the existing volume of HGVs using Oxestalls Road junction
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the removal of centre line markings on Evelyn Street
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 will not improve safety for cyclists
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 will not improve safety for pedestrians
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support the removal of centre line markings on Evelyn Street

Impact on cycling

38 (1 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road to affect cycling. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:
• 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support segregated cycle tracks on Evelyn Street
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about safe access onto CS4 from opposite side roads such as Alloa, Scawen, Grinstead Roads
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested the two way cycle track should be on the south side of Evelyn Street
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said the existing road layout is sufficient for cyclists
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that the proposed track on Evelyn Street is too narrow
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that CS4 takes the back street route in this section, for example, through Plough Way and Grove Street
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested one way cycle tracks on both sides of the road instead of two way cycle track
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support cycle priority across side roads, for example Rainsborough Avenue

**Impact on motorists**

32 (1 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road to affect motorists. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 18 (<1 per cent) respondents said that CS4 will worsen existing congestion
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents expressed concern about the existing level of congestion in the area
• 18 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose reallocation of road space to cyclists

**Impact on bus users**

22 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road to affect bus users. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents expressed concern about the removal of westbound bus lane on Evelyn Street
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the proposed relocation of bus stops
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said that CS4 will cause bus delays
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Impact on pedestrians
19 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road to affect pedestrians. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support improved pedestrian crossings and footways
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 would have a negative impact on pedestrians
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the risk of cyclists / pedestrian conflicts at bus stop bypasses
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed moving crossing 150m east on Evelyn Street

Principles of the scheme
14 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road and how they relate to the principles of the scheme. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that Oxestalls Road mini roundabout design prioritises motor vehicles over active travel
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they cycle tracks as they are not well used
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said that the consultation has not engaged with local residents
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose banning motorcycles from bus lanes

Scope of scheme
13 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road and how it relates to the scope of the scheme. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents called for CS4 to come to Lower Road
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents complained that double yellow restrictions are harsh on local residents
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that cycle hire bikes are implemented along the CS4 route
Environmental impacts

7 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact they expected our proposals for Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road to have on the environment.

- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 will worsen existing pollution on the route
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they were concerned about the existing level of pollution in the area
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for more green infrastructure

Question 8: ‘Do you have any comments on the proposals for Evelyn Street / Abinger Grove?’

316 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Evelyn Street / Abinger Grove and the issues raised are shown below. Percentages are calculated from the total number of respondents.

Comments on changes to junctions

54 (2 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for the junctions on this section. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support filtering of traffic at Sayes Court / Prince Street junction from Evelyn Street
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose the proposed banned right turns
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested a traffic light controlled junction instead of mini roundabout at Abinger Grove junction
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about cyclists turning right from CS4 onto Deptford High Street
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 bypassing the Abinger Grove mini roundabout
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said the Evelyn Street / Abinger Grove junction is difficult for all road users
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose changes to the Deptford High Street crossing
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for general improvements to Sayes Court Road and Princes Street junction
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested parallel cycle / pedestrian crossing instead of toucan crossing at Gosterwood Street
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested removing the mini roundabout to allow for wider cycle path
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for a safe cycle route for cyclists travelling north-south through Abinger Grove mini roundabout
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support cyclist priority at side roads
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support no entry for traffic joining Evelyn Street from Prince Street / Sayes Court Street
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support the proposed banned right turns

Impact on motorists
33 (1 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Evelyn Street / Abinger Grove to affect motorists. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said that CS4 will worsen existing congestion
• 7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about rat running on Prince Street, Watergate Street, Borthwick Street, Deptford Green, Stowage and Gonson Street
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the existing level of congestion on the CS4 route
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said that CS4 would worsen the existing pollution on the route
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that congestion caused by CS4 will delay emergency vehicles
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose the reduction in motor vehicles access between side roads and Evelyn Street
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the impact of CS4 on the development at Convoys Wharf

Scope of scheme
29 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for Evelyn Street / Abinger Grove and how it relates to the scope of the scheme. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents called for CS4 to connect with Quietway 1
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support segregated cycle tracks
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that cycle hire bikes are implemented along the CS4 route
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for CS4 to connect with the Thames Path
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for motorcycles are allowed in the bus lane

Impact on bus users
22 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Evelyn Street / Abinger Grove to affect bus users. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said that CS4 will cause bus delays
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents expressed opposed the removal of the bus lane
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed the proposed relocation of Sayes Court Estate bus stop

Impact on safety
13 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Evelyn Street / Abinger Grove to affect safety. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents called for improved safety measures for cyclists at Abinger Grove roundabout
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the lack of pedestrian provision at Abinger Grove mini roundabout

Question 9: ‘Do you have any comments on the proposals for Evelyn Street / Deptford High Street?’
348 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Evelyn Street / Deptford High Street and the issues raised are shown below. Percentages are calculated from the total number of respondents.

Comments on changes to junctions
78 (2 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for the junctions on this section. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 11 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose banned right turns at the Deptford High Street / Evelyn Street junction
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the right turn on to Deptford High Street coming from the west
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support banned right turns at Deptford High Street / Evelyn Street junction
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested making the pedestrian crossing to Deptford High Street into a parallel cycle / pedestrian crossing

• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about motorists ignoring banned right turns at the Deptford High Street / Evelyn Street intersection

• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the potential impact of banned right turns in and out of Deptford High Street

• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested cyclists are permitted to make the right turn into Deptford High Street

• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents called for the pedestrian crossing to Deptford High Street to be made a toucan crossing

• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support measures to simplify the Deptford High Street junction for all road users

• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about cyclists access from Deptford High Street onto Creek Road

• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support combining two pedestrian crossings into one

• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about cyclists access from Deptford High Street to Watergate Street

• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about northbound cyclist access to CS4

• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested a mini roundabout at the junction of Evelyn Street / Deptford High Street

• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for banned right turn from Evelyn Street to Watergate Street

• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for cyclist-only access in and out of Deptford High Street

• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for clear signage directing cyclists wanting to access Deptford High Street

• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for traffic light controlled junction at Evelyn Street / Deptford High Street

• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support keeping New King Street no entry from Evelyn Street
Scope of scheme

52 (2 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for Evelyn Street / Deptford High Street and how it relates to the scope of the scheme. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents called for CS4 to connect with Quietway 1
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents called for CS4 to be extended to Greenwich
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support measures to prevent rat running on Watergate Street and New King Street
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents expressed concern that consultation materials show a gap on CS4 between the end of the Evelyn Street / Deptford High Street section and the start of the Creek Road / Deptford Church Street section
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support regeneration of Deptford

Impact on motorists

32 (1 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Evelyn Street / Deptford High Street to affect motorists. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said that CS4 will worsen existing congestion
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the existing level of congestion on the CS4 route
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that rat running would increase as a result of CS4
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the impact of CS4 on construction vehicles accessing Convoys Wharf

Impact on cycling

28 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Evelyn Street / Deptford High Street to affect cycling. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 14 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will be safer for cyclists than current road layout
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support segregated cycle tracks on CS4
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that poor driver behaviour makes cycling the current route dangerous
Impact on pedestrians

19 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Evelyn Street / Deptford High Street to affect pedestrians. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents expressed concern that the existing layout is dangerous for pedestrians
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents called for the pedestrian guardrails on Evelyn Street and Deptford High Street to be retained
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 would have a positive impact on pedestrians
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents expressed concern about the existing long wait for pedestrians due to traffic light phasing
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will be safer for pedestrians than the current road layout
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support the proposed pedestrian crossing at Evelyn Street / Deptford High Street

Environmental impacts

18 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on the impact they expected our proposals for Evelyn Street / Deptford High Street to have on the environment.

- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents called for additional tree planting along CS4
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents expressed concern at the removal of the tree at New King Street
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support further improvements to the urban realm

Impact on bus users

7 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Evelyn Street / Deptford High Street to affect bus users. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said that CS4 will cause bus delays
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed removing bus lanes

Question 10: ‘Do you have any comments on the proposals for Creek Road / Deptford Church Street?’

373 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Creek Road / Deptford Church Street and the issues raised are shown below. Percentages are calculated from the total number of respondents.
Scope of scheme
46 (1 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for Creek Road / Deptford Church Street and how it relates to the scope of the scheme. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 26 (<1 per cent) respondents called for CS4 to be extended along Deptford Church Street
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents called for CS4 to connect with Quietway 1
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents called for CS4 to be extended further east / south east (without specifying)
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose the removal of trees
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for further public realm improvements
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for CS4 to be extended into Greenwich

Comments on changes to junctions
33 (1 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for the junctions on this section. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support the cyclists bypass of Deptford Church Street junction
- 4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support safer right turning into Deptford Church street for cyclists
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about conflicts between vehicles and cyclists where CS4 has priority over side roads
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents expressed concern that turning right in and out of Deptford Church Street is confusing and potentially dangerous
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents called for adequate waiting space for cyclists making two-stage turns into Deptford Church Street from CS4 cycle tracks
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said that CS4 will worsen existing congestion on the route
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for shorter waiting times for pedestrian and cycle crossings in this area

Impact on cycling
27 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Creek Road / Deptford Church Street to affect cycling. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 9 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support segregated cycle tracks on CS4
4 (<1 per cent) respondents called for wider cycle tracks

3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support cycle track priority over side roads

2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested Give Way signs to signal cycle priority at side roads

2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested one way cycle tracks on both sides of road instead of two way cycle track

Impact on bus users
12 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Creek Road / Deptford Church Street to affect bus users. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

6 (<1 per cent) respondents said that CS4 will cause bus delays

4 (<1 per cent) respondents opposed removing bus lanes

Impact on safety
12 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Creek Road / Deptford Church Street to affect safety.

7 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned that the existing layout is dangerous for cycling around Deptford Church Street / Creek Road

3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support CS4 as it will be safer for cyclists than current road layout

2 (<1 per cent) respondents said that poor driver behaviour makes cycling the current route dangerous and unpleasant

Impact on pedestrians
9 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Creek Road / Deptford Church Street to affect pedestrians. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

4 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose staggered pedestrian crossings on CS4 route

3 (<1 per cent) respondents expressed concern about the risk of pedestrian / cyclist conflict
Question 11: ‘Do you have any comments on the proposals for Creek Road / Norway Street?’

400 respondents provided comments on the proposals for Creek Road / Norway Street and the issues raised are shown below. Percentages are calculated from the total number of respondents.

Scope of scheme

130 (4 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for Creek Road / Norway Street and how it relates to the scope of the scheme. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 51 (2 per cent) respondents called for CS4 to be extended to Greenwich town centre
- 22 (<1 per cent) respondents called for CS4 to be extended to Woolwich
- 10 (<1 per cent) respondents called for CS4 to be extended to Greenwich Park
- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents called for CS4 to connect with the Thames Path
- 7 (<1 per cent) respondents called for CS4 to connect with Quietway 1
- 6 (<1 per cent) respondents called for CS4 to be extended further east / south east (without specifying)
- 5 (<1 per cent) respondents called for improved cycling facilities in the Cutty Sark area
- 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose the cycle track replacing bus lanes
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for stricter parking restrictions
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for CS4 to be extended to Charlton
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for CS4 to be extended to Lewisham
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for improved signage for onward routes at the end of CS4
- 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for cycle hire bikes to be implemented along the CS4 route

Comments on changes to junctions

70 (2 per cent) respondents commented on our proposals for the junctions on this section. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

- 8 (<1 per cent) respondents said they right turn into Haddo Street should be maintained
• 6 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support improved cycle infrastructure at the Greenwich gyratory
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that cyclist access from CS4 to Haddo Street is improved
• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that the Creek Road / Norman Road junction design needs to be improved for cyclists
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that Clarence Road is connected to Copperas Street by a toucan crossing
• 4 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that cyclists are given priority at Glaisher Street junction by through a raised cycle track for example
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that cyclist access from CS4 to Norman Road is improved
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested that cyclists should have priority at the Dowells Street junction, when continuing on Norway Street
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents expressed concern about how CS4 would interact with the operation of the road bridge over Deptford Creek
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose the staggered crossing at Glaisher Street
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested a 'hold the left' for left turning vehicles into Glaisher Street
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents suggested a central island for pedestrians on the crossing at Clarence Road / Copperas Street
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents called for clearer cyclists priority where vehicles cross the cycle track at the petrol station between Glaisher Street and Clarence Road
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents support the removal of a traffic lane on Glaisher Street

**Impact on cycling**

22 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Creek Road / Norway Street to affect cycling. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 10 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support segregated cycle tracks on CS4
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said CS4 would be safer for cyclists than the current road layout
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about CS4’s integration with the continued highway of end of the route on Creek Road

Impact on pedestrians
13 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Creek Road / Norway Street to affect pedestrians. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they oppose moving the pedestrian crossing to the western arm of Norman Road / Norway Road junction
• 3 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support moving the pedestrian crossing to the western arm of Norman Road / Norway Road junction
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said they support the use of straight ahead crossings

Impact on motorists
10 (<1 per cent) respondents commented on how they expected the proposals for Evelyn Street / Norway Street to affect motorists. Only comments that occurred more than once are included in this section:

• 5 (<1 per cent) respondents said they are concerned about the retention of banned left turn from Norway Road on to Creek Road
• 2 (<1 per cent) respondents said that CS4 will worsen existing congestion
Appendix B: Petitions and campaigns

No petitions were received during this consultation. We have reproduced the standard text that made up each of the campaign responses that were identified by our analysts. In some instances, respondents added additional comments to campaign responses. All campaign responses, including those with additional comments, have been fully considered as part of this consultation process.

Campaign text from London Cycling Campaign – 1,350 responses

“I strongly support your proposals for Cycle Superhighway 4 from Tower Bridge to Greenwich.

It’s vital south east London gets a Cycle Superhighway along this route – enabling far more people to cycle and walk to local shops and amenities and to and from central London. I want this scheme improved with safer junctions (particularly the side roads), and wider tracks, and extended to go all the way to Woolwich, through Greenwich town centre, and to connect to the East-West and/or North-South Cycle Superhighway in central London.

And I want the Lower Road section to come to consultation as soon as possible – there is no CS4 without a high-quality, direct route through this area, that links to the planned Rotherhithe-Canary Wharf bridge. I also want more consideration given to linking to key destinations and amenities on the route and nearby – so more kids can ride to school, more people can ride to the shops etc. – and to other cycle routes such as Quietway 1.

More specifically:

- I support the proposals for Tooley Street/Tower Bridge Road, but I don’t think that bus lanes are suitable to enable a wider range of people to cycle, and I’d like to see cycle tracks and/or other measures urgently across Tower Bridge.

- I support the proposals for Jamaica Road/Bevington Street. In addition, Abbey Street and Bevington Street appear wide enough to feature segregated cycle tracks.

- I support the proposals for Jamaica Road/Southwark Park Road. However, here and throughout the scheme, side road junctions need further work here to ensure maximum bidirectional track safety. And Southwark Park Road itself needs improvement – reducing motor vehicle volumes and speeds or restricting through traffic from it and improving the junction itself.

- I strongly support the proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout - the parallel crossings will need careful design to ensure all drivers stop.

- I support the proposals for Evelyn Street/Oxestalls Road. But the design around Oxestalls Road will create unnecessary conflict between pedestrians and those..."
cycling, including those using both modes arriving at or departing from the primary school and prioritises motor vehicles over active travel.

-I support the proposals for Evelyn Street/Abinger Grove. Filtering the Sayes Court Street/Princes Street junction would be a potentially better solution.

-I support the proposals for Evelyn Street/Deptford High Street. Further work needed to improve cycling and walking priority at the northern side streets and to link CS4 to Deptford High Street -I support the proposals for Creek Road/Deptford Church Street. Further protection is needed urgently onto and along Deptford Church Street. And the track is too narrow here.

-I support the proposals for Creek Road/Norway Street. Glaisher Street and Norway Street (as well as the Norman Road junction) need further work to ensure they can be used for safe cycling by a wide range of people.”

**Campaign text from Sustrans – 80 responses**

“I’m emailing to express my support for Cycle Superhighway 4 between Tower Bridge and Greenwich. I strongly support the proposals for Dutch-style segregated cycle tracks, with associated traffic signals, to keep people cycling safe from traffic on the A200.

I also support proposals for five new signal-controlled pedestrian crossings and the proposed upgrades to pedestrian crossings. Together they will make the route much safer and more appealing for cycling and walking.

The scheme should extend further west to London Bridge and east to Woolwich, as originally proposed. I also expect a consultation to come forward for proposals for Lower Road section next year (2018).”

**Campaign text from Depford Folk – 15 responses**

“I am a resident of Deptford and have reviewed the current proposal CS-4 that will provide a segregated cycle lane on Evelyn Street.

On the whole I support the proposals and look forward to its construction. I would like to provide the following constructive feedback regarding the segment of CS-4 in close proximity with Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens (Section 6, 7, & 8). It should be noted that 10,000+ new homes are being built in Deptford over the next few years and CS4 should be used as an opportunity to improve the public realm including pedestrian access to green spaces and the wider environment. Accessibility for pedestrians in the area is poor and I would expect CS-4 to bring improvements to make pavements fit for purpose.

I ask for new trees to be planted along the route (Section 6, 7, & 8) to help improve air quality in the area. According to a recent study the level of pollution in Deptford is 6x the legal limit. In addition Deptford Park school, adjacent to Oxestalls Road, is
part of the Mayor of London’s 50 schools undergoing air quality audits this year. Results will be published in March 2018 but recommendations include green infrastructure such as barrier bushes along busy roads and in playgrounds to help to filter toxic fumes. I would like to see this incorporated into the CS4 plans to help improve the health of local children.


https://citizensense.net/data-stories-deptford/#pepys

Junction improvements

I support Deptford Folk and Lewisham Cyclists. I agree with their comments on our local junctions:

1. Oxestalls Rd.

The significant diversion around the mini-roundabout at Oxestalls Rd is a poor design. It will be a major delay point for cyclists. Ways to retain a signal-controlled T-junction should be further examined, with traffic signals monitored by SCOOT, and east bound traffic should not be allowed to turn left into Oxestalls road. This would allow for 4 phases at the junction with a separate phase for westbound traffic travelling straight and turning right, a phase for eastbound traffic with CS4 sharing this phase and also the pedestrian crossing sharing this phase. This would then allow for a separate phase for Oxestalls road traffic. This would deliver a safe pedestrian crossing, early start signalling for CS4 with design similar to oval triangle, where left hook risks have been designed out by traffic lights and kerb separation. This would also provide safer access to Deptford Park primary school for those on foot or bike. This would also negate the need to relocate a potentially busy pedestrian crossing 150 metres east, continuing to provide easier access to Deptford Park.

2. Grinstead Road/Alloa Road.

The link to Grinstead Road could be improved by a simple gap in the kerb on the segregated track along with a refuge to access into and out of the side road. Similar arrangements should be made at Alloa Road. I’d like to see a pedestrian crossing across Grinstead Road to make access to Deptford Park safer. In addition the junctions of these streets should have safe pedestrian crossings to prioritise north/south pedestrian movement Evelyn Street.

3. Safe connecting routes between CS4 and Q1 are important.

If this is done well, a wider network of safe routes in South East London begins to open up, making Cycling accessible and desirable to much greater numbers of people, offering real potential for significant modal shift. Serious thought should be
given to this both at Deptford High Street and also Greenwich Town Centre as part of developing this wider network of routes. Clarification is needed as to how people on bikes will negotiate Deptford High St/New King Street junction.


LBL, Sustrans, Lewisham Cyclists and Deptford Folk are formulating plans to re-open Canal Approach for walking & cycling under Evelyn St and linking back to Quietway 1 at Folkestone Gardens. CS4 plans should make provision for this which would connect walking and cycling routes and provide a traffic free link to New Bermondsey - the proposed new station on the Overground line to Clapham Junction.

5. Rolt Street

It is also not clear how CS4 users get to/from Rolt St. We are assuming that some kind of shared pavement access to the crossing which will be a toucan or Copenhagen style. Please consider that this crossing is used to access Clyde Nursery and should protect children and parents from all types of traffic. I'd like to see the 'pocket park' at the top of Gosterwood Street renovated and improved including the planting of a plane tree in the vacant tree pits."

Campaign text from Shad Thames Independent Group – 11 responses

"The addition of Cycle Superhighway CS4 is not a priority for the area.

Suitable cycle lanes, cycle Quietways, parks and bus lanes exist which adequately cater for the needs of cyclists.

The quantity and type of vehicles using local roads e.g. Jamaica Road needs to be addressed ahead of implementing CS4 which will only increase congestion, pollution and misery for those who live nearby.

Sacrificing bus lanes to enable CS4 e.g. Jamaica Road westbound by Bermondsey Tube Station will increase local congestion and increase bus journey times. Traffic modelling for CS4 states that bus journey times will increase for the five bus routes most significantly affected by CS4. This will discourage people from using buses / public transport and is counter to the Mayor’s and TfL’s target of increasing travel by public transport. Furthermore, the continuous filtering of traffic due to the removal of bus lanes will confuse drivers, resulting in frustration and potentially dangerous driving.

CS4 will force traffic to move more slowly – resulting in congestion, pollution, noise and loss of amenity for those who live in surrounding areas. Many schools and their playgrounds are adjacent to the CS4 route."
Many of the vehicles using the roads on the proposed CS4 route are lorries, trucks and vans. None of these drivers will be able to change their mode of transport to cycles which questions how much traffic CS4 will alleviate.

The middle section of CS4 is subject to a separate consultation (CS4 Lower Road). The consultation for CS4 must be a single consultation with all designs and plans in place. Seeking feedback on isolated sections is both pointless and a waste of taxpayer’s money.

CS4 needs to be planned and consulted in tandem with the consultation for the proposed river crossing between Rotherhithe and Canary Wharf.

Before any further Cycle Superhighways are built, TfL should focus their attention on resolving the issues witnessed at existing Cycle Superhighways. The East West Cycle Superhighway along Victoria Embankment has increased congestion which prevents emergency vehicles responding to incidents (as they get stuck in single lane traffic) - all because of an underutilised Cycle Superhighway (used in during rush hours and weekdays only).

Instead of Cycle Superhighways, TfL should turn their attention to introducing low emission zones, consolidating deliveries and collections and implementing vehicle weight / length limits to ease congestion and by default make the roads safer and more appealing to cyclists.

Shad Thames (the road) at the junction with Tooley Street / Jamaica Road cannot be made one-way, northbound only without a much wider consideration of local road network.

- If Shad Thames (the road) becomes northbound only then this means there will only be two exits from the Shad Thames area (Lafone Street and Queen Elizabeth Street). A reduction from only three exits to two.

- Leaving the Shad Thames area via Queen Elizabeth Street > Tower Bridge Road will only serve only traffic wishing to travel southbound due to existing restrictions on Tower Bridge Road.

- Lafone Street will therefore carry most of traffic leaving the area i.e. travelling north and west (via Tanner Street / Druid Street one-way) and east (via Tooley Street / Jamaica Road).

- The Lafone Street junction with Tooley Street will not be managed by traffic lights so is likely to see vehicles queuing along Lafone Street which is a small residential street. This will result in a loss of amenity for residents in Boss House, Raven Wharf and Fountain Court through increased congestion, noise and pollution.
- Drivers leaving the area via Lafone Street will find it very difficult to execute the left turn into Tooley Street safely because of the two-way cycle traffic. This will be a danger to cyclists, especially during busy periods.

- Increased congestion and delays will lead to frustration and potentially dangerous driving.

- Making one section of road one-way will by default force traffic down specific roads resulting in increased noise, traffic, disturbance and pollution for some residents whilst others will see the opposite – creating winners and losers.

- The proposal of making Shad Thames (the road) northbound only has not considered the following issues and impacts:

  - Almost 1200 car parking spaces in Shad Thames, Gainsford Street, Curlew Street and Queen Elizabeth Street will be forced to find different routes out of the area resulting in loss of amenity for affected residents.

  - Delivery and collection vehicles – which are large and many – will be forced to change the way they leave the area resulting in loss of amenity for affected residents.

  - One-way systems encourage speeding.

- TfL must work more closely with the Highways team at Southwark Council before proposing such changes. It is clear from conversations with the TfL CS4 design engineer and Southwark Council Highways Project Manager that this element of the proposal should have been excluded. This proposal is for Southwark Council to suggest and address and is currently captured in their Shad Thames Improvement Scheme consultation (under long term – 5-10 year outlook)."

**Campaign text from Southwark Cyclists – 8 responses**

“This response is on behalf of Southwark Cyclists, the London Cycling Campaign Group for the Borough of Southwark. It has been prepared with input from many of our members. Detailed comments are restricted to the Southwark sections 1-4.

**General Comments**

1. It is great to see CS4 at Consultation and with a design that meets many of our aspirations. A segregated path from Tower Bridge Road to Lower Rd with safe routes past all major junctions. We hope that plans for the Surrey Quays Gyratory will go to consultation before the end of 2017. Without an equally high quality route through the Gyratory the Southwark part of CS4 will lose much of its value. It is also our hope that detailed plans for the section from Tower Bridge Rd to London Bridge will be published in 2018.
2. Numbers. Key to the success of this route will be making it good enough to cope with likely cycling numbers. Present peak unidirectional flows are 1100 cyclists per hour. This has risen steadily from 630 per hour in 2012. The trip rate of 3500 total for cyclists on the A200 given in the consultation information is very out of date. It will be at least 6000 now and possibly 7-8000. The Mayor hopes to increase cycling by at least 2-fold over the next decade. Given this ambition, and the steady growth over recent years, this route needs to accommodate peak flows of at least 2000/hour.

3. Lane widths. The London Cycling Design Standards recommend at least 4m for bidirectional paths with high cycle flows. Note that even at peak flow, there is still a 14% flow in the opposite direction. Our counts show that going with the main flow will still be passing one cyclists every 15 sec in the opposite direction. The consultation states the lane will be 3-4m in width. 3m is not enough. As the drawings are not to scale it is impossible to judge how much of the path is 3m. There is usually some central reservation that could be removed and on other places quite wide pavements. In line with the LCDS, the Southwark sections of CS4 must be at least 4m throughout. If they are not, CS4 will fail to cope with the expected numbers of cyclists. This will put people off trying to cycle and so make it difficult to achieve the Mayor’s ambition of getting a lot more people cycling.

4. It is unfortunate that 4 aspects of the plan are detrimental to motor traffic but are irrelevant to CS4. These are the 1-way schemes for Shad Thames and Cathay St, the bus gate at Rotherhithe roundabout and the no-entry at Marigold St. These features should not have been in the CS4 consultation. They should have been dealt with in separate consultations that could look at the merits of each. Much of the response to the consultation will be determined by these features. We hope, in analyzing responses, TfL will separate out those that deal with CS4, and those that deal with these irrelevant add-ons. It would be straightforward to build CS4 without any of these 4 changes.

5. Some small suggestions:

a. St James Road. It must be possible for cyclists to enter and exit CS4 safely at St James Rd. As proposed for Abbey St, the traffic lights need an extra stage. St James Rd is a popular route for cyclists as it runs directly to the Old Kent Rd.

b. If the Shad Thames 1-way is brought in, then a cycle contraflow is needed for south/east bound cyclists. This is the National Cycle Route 4 alignment and is popular with cyclists (about 14% of cyclists at Dockhead use this route)."
Campaign text from Deptford High Street Businesses – 4 responses

“As part of the consultation process I am concerned that the planning here will impact on trade down Deptford High Street with no right turn into the street and also no right turn out to go towards Greenwich?

This development could severely impact on many small independent businesses including that of my family’s business on Deptford High Street with regards to flow of customer traffic in vehicles and delivery of stock on market days when the upper side is closed to traffic from Griffin Street.

The diversion of traffic into and out of Deptford High Street from Evelyn Street makes no logical sense? I believe that the concept of a dedicated bicycle route is necessary but this can be implemented without creating the barrier to traffic that you are proposing from the picture”
Appendix C: Consultation questions

How the questions were organised
For CS4, we divided the proposed route into 10 sections to make it easier for people to digest the information and give feedback on areas of particular interest to them.

Our survey included a closed question asking people to select an answer that matched their level of support or opposition to the overall scheme and each of its route sections (apart from Section 5, Lower Road). Of all the questions in the survey, only the closed question on the overall scheme was mandatory.

We also gave respondents the chance to provide comments on the overall scheme and each section. We did not invite comment on Section 5, Lower Road, which will be consulted on at a later date.

Questions about our overall proposals (Q1 mandatory)
1. Do you support the overall proposals?
   * Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose
2. Do you have any comments on the overall proposals? (Q2 optional)

Questions about our proposals by section (all optional)
3. Do you support the proposals for Tooley Street / Tower Bridge Road?
   * Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose
   Do you have any comments on the proposals for Tooley Street / Tower Bridge Road?
4. Do you support the proposals for Jamaica Road / Bevington Street?
   * Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose
   Do you have any comments on the proposals for Jamaica Road / Bevington Street?
5. Do you support the proposals for Jamaica Road / Southwark Park Road?
   * Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose
   Do you have any comments on the proposals for Jamaica Road / Southwark Park Road?
6. Do you support the proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout?
   * Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose
   Do you have any comments on the proposals for Rotherhithe Roundabout?
7. Do you support the proposals for Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road?
   * Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose
   Do you have any comments on the proposals for Evelyn Street / Oxestalls Road?
8. Do you support the proposals for Evelyn Street / Abinger Grove?
   * Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose
   Do you have any comments on the proposals for Evelyn Street / Abinger Grove?
9. Do you support the proposals for Evelyn Street / Deptford High Street?
   Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose
   Do you have any comments on the proposals for Evelyn Street / Deptford High Street?

10. Do you support the proposals for Creek Road / Deptford Church Street?
    Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose
    Do you have any comments on the proposals for Creek Road / Deptford Church Street?

11. Do you support our proposals for Creek Road / Norway Street?
    Strongly support, Support, Neither support nor oppose, Oppose, Strongly oppose
    Do you have any comments on our proposals for Creek Road / Norway Street?

Questions about the respondents

12. What’s your name?

13. What is your email address?

14. Please provide us with your postcode?

15. Are you? (please tick all boxes that apply)
   Local resident, A local business owner, Employed locally, A visitor to the area, A commuter to area, Not local, but interested in the scheme, A taxi/private hire vehicle driver, Other (Please specify)

16. How do you travel through the area? (please tick all boxes that apply)
   Private car, Taxi, Van, Lorry, Bus, Coach, Cycle, Walk/Wheelchair, Tube, Train, Motorcycle/powered two-wheeler, Other (please specify)

17. If responding on behalf of an organisation, business or campaign group, please provide us with the name:

18. How did you find out about this consultation?
   Received an email from TfL, Received a letter from TfL, Read about it in the press, Saw it on the TfL website, Social media, Word of mouth, Other (please specify)

19. What do you think about the quality of this consultation (for example, the information we have provided, any printed material you have received, any maps or plans, the website and questionnaire etc.) (please specify)
   Very good, Good, Acceptable, Poor, Very poor (please select only one item)
   Do you have any further comments about the quality of the consultation material?
Appendix D: Consultation materials

This section includes the following:

1. The letter and overview map that was sent to properties close to the proposed route
2. A map of the distribution area for the leaflet
3. The material that was included on our consultation web page
4. Copies of the material that was used as part of our consultation drop-in events
5. A copy of the email that was sent to stakeholder organisations at the beginning of the consultation
Transport for London

28 September 2017

Dear Sir or Madam,

Have your say on Cycle Superhighway Route 4

We are proposing to transform roads in Bermondsey, Rotherhithe, Deptford and Greenwich to make cycling and walking easier and safer as part of Cycle Superhighway 4 (CS4) from Tower Bridge to Greenwich. The proposals do not include the Lower Road section of CS4, which will be consulted on at a later date.

CS4 forms part of the Mayor of London’s Healthy Streets Approach, a long-term vision to encourage more Londoners to walk, cycle and use public transport, by making London’s streets heather, safer and a more appealing environment for everyone to enjoy. CS4 is designed to help us meet the target set out in the Mayor’s draft Transport Strategy, of changing the way people choose to travel, so that 50% of all London trips are made by foot, bicycle or public transport by 2041, up from 54% today.

The proposed changes in your area include:

- New two-way segregated cycle track on Tooley Street and Jamaica Road, providing a dedicated space for people who want to cycle
- Three new signal-controlled pedestrian crossings along Jamaica Road, making it easier and safer to cross the road
- Upgrades to existing pedestrian crossings, including simpler 8 metre wide pedestrian crossing outside Bermondsey Underground Station
- Building on the recent short term improvements at Rotherhithe Roundabout, by redesigning the roundabout to improve safety as part of our Safer Junctions programme
- Installing a new eastbound bus gate on the Jamaica Road approach to Rotherhithe Roundabout. This will give buses priority at the roundabout and facilitate better bus access in to Lower Road.
- Extending the left turn lane on Jamaica Road, to reduce queuing time for buses and local traffic trying to access Brunel Road
- Making Shad Thames one-way northbound, to improve the performance of the junction and reduce pedestrian wait times
- Banning the left turn into Evington Street from Jamaica Road, to provide a continuous eastbound bus lane and improve the progression of buses
- Making Cathy Street one-way northbound, to stop through traffic from using residential roads and allowing the right turn in to Cathay Street from Jamaica Road to improve local access
- Making Marigold Street exit only on to Jamaica Road, to improve safety for all road users
- Changes to some bus stop layouts and bus stop bypasses for cyclists

MAYOR OF LONDON
The enclosed map shows some of the main changes proposed. Detailed proposals and additional information, including predicted traffic impacts can be viewed at: tfl.gov.uk/cs4

Lower Road
Lower Road is adjacent to Canada Water, an area that will see major regeneration and development in the next few years. To understand how developments and future transport schemes would affect the existing road network, we have jointly commissioned a Strategic Transport Study with Southwark Council. When completed, this study will inform the design for Lower Road, ensuring that it meets the future needs of the community. Consultation on proposals for the Lower Road section of CS4 will be undertaken next year.

Public exhibitions
We will be holding public exhibitions in Southwark, as well as in Lewisham and Greenwich, where you can view the proposals, speak to members of the project team and ask questions. Details of our plans and other events can be viewed in the following ways:

- By visiting: tfl.gov.uk/cs4
- At Blue Anchor and Blue Canada Water libraries, where copies have been provided
- At the following public exhibitions in Southwark:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bermond Community</td>
<td>177 Abbey Street</td>
<td>Tuesday 3 October</td>
<td>15:00-19:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>SE1 2AN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Finnish Church</td>
<td>33 Albion Street</td>
<td>Wednesday 25 October</td>
<td>15:00-19:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE16 7JG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Finnish Church</td>
<td>33 Albion Street</td>
<td>Saturday 4 November</td>
<td>11:00-15:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE16 7JG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have your say on the proposals
Your views are important to us. The responses to this consultation will help inform our decision making. To find out more and let us know what you think about our proposals, visit tfl.gov.uk/cs4. You can also tell us your views by emailing consultations@tfl.gov.uk, writing to FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATIONS, or calling 0343 222 1155.

The consultation runs from Thursday 28 September to Sunday 19 November 2017.

If you require paper copies of our plans and a response form, copies in Braille, large text or another language, please contact us using the details above.

Next steps
We will analyse and consider all responses received, and will publish our results in early 2018. Construction of the scheme would be subject to the outcome of this consultation.

Please tell us your views by Sunday 19 November 2017

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

Jay Daisi
Consultation Team
Transport for London
Transport for London

TFL Consultation Team
FREEPOST TFL
CONSULTATIONS
consultations@tfl.gov.uk

28 September 2017

Dear Sir or Madam,

Have your say on Cycle Superhighway Route 4

In partnership with London Boroughs, we are proposing to transform roads in Bermondsey, Rotherhithe, Deptford and Greenwich to make cycling and walking easier and safer as part of Cycle Superhighway 4 (CS4) from Tower Bridge to Greenwich. The proposals do not include the Lower Road section of CS4, which will be consulted on at a later date.

CS4 forms part of the Mayor of London’s Healthy Streets Approach, a long-term vision to encourage more Londoners to walk, cycle and use public transport, by making London’s streets healthier, safer and a more appealing environment for everyone to enjoy. CS4 is designed to help us meet the target set out in the Mayor’s draft Transport Strategy, of changing the way people choose to travel, so that 80% of all London trips are made by foot, bicycle or public transport by 2041, up from 64% today.

The proposed changes in your area include:

- New two-way segregated cycle track on Evelyn Street and Creek Road providing a dedicated space for people who want to cycle
- New signal-controlled pedestrian crossings at Gasterwood Street and Deptford Church Street making it easier and safer to cross the road
- Upgrades to existing pedestrian crossings including 6 metre wide toucan crossing outside Deptford Park Primary school
- New mini-roundabout replaces signalised junction at Oxestalls Road to improve journey times for all road users
- Wider footways and opportunity for new urban realm at Deptford High Street
- Banning the right turn on to Evelyn Street from Watergate Street and Deptford High Street and banning the right turn in to Deptford High Street from Evelyn Street
- Changes to some bus stop locations and layouts and bus stop bypasses for cyclists
- Replacing some single yellow lines with double yellow lines along Evelyn Street and Creek Road

The enclosed map shows some of the main changes proposed. Detailed proposals and additional information, including predicted traffic impacts can be viewed at: tfl.gov.uk/cs4
Lower Road
Lower Road is adjacent to Canada Water, an area that will see major regeneration and development in the next few years. To understand how developments and future transport schemes would affect the existing road network, we have jointly commissioned a Strategic Transport Study with Southwark Council. When completed, this study will inform the design for Lower Road – ensuring that it meets the future needs of the community. Consultation on proposals for the Lower Road section of CS4 will be undertaken next year.

Public exhibitions
We will be holding public exhibitions in Lewisham, as well as in Greenwich and Southwark, where you can view the proposals, speak to members of the project team and ask questions. Details of our plans and other events can be viewed in the following ways:
• By visiting: tfl.gov.uk/cs4
• At Deptford Lounge, where copies have been provided for your reference
• At the following public exhibitions in Lewisham:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Lounge</td>
<td>9 Giffin Street, SE8 4RH</td>
<td>Thursday 5th October</td>
<td>15:00-19:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Lounge</td>
<td>9 Giffin Street, SE8 4RH-I</td>
<td>Saturday 14th October</td>
<td>11:00-15:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have your say on the proposals
Your views are important to us. The responses to this consultation will help inform our decision making. To find out more and let us know what you think about our proposals, visit tfl.gov.uk/cs4. You can also tell us your views by emailing consultations@tfl.gov.uk, writing to FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATIONS, or calling 0343 222 1155.

The consultation runs from Thursday 28 September to Sunday 19 November 2017.

If you require paper copies of our plans and a response form, copies in Braille, large text or another language, please contact us using the details above.

Next steps
We will analyse and consider all responses received, and will publish our results in early 2018. Construction of the scheme would be subject to the outcome of this consultation.

Please tell us your views by Sunday 19 November 2017

Yours faithfully,

Anna Pastore
Consultation Team
Transport for London
28 September 2017

Dear Sir or Madam,

Have your say on Cycle Superhighway Route 4

We are proposing to transform roads in Bermondsey, Rotherhithe, Deptford and Greenwich to make cycling and walking easier and safer as part of Cycle Superhighway 4 (CS4) from Tower Bridge to Greenwich. The proposals do not include the Lower Road section of CS4, which will be consulted on at a later date.

CS4 forms part of the Mayor of London’s Healthy Streets Approach, a long-term vision to encourage more Londoners to walk, cycle and use public transport, by making London’s streets healthier, safer and more appealing environment for everyone to enjoy. CS4 is designed to help us meet the target set out in the Mayor’s draft Transport Strategy, of changing the way people choose to travel, so that 80% of all London trips are made by foot, bicycle or public transport by 2041, up from 64% today.

The proposed changes in your area include:

- New two-way segregated cycle track on Evelyn Street and Creek Road providing a dedicated space for people who want to cycle
- New signal-controlled pedestrian crossings at Gasterwood Street and Deptford Church Street making it easier and safer to cross the road
- Upgrades to existing pedestrian crossings including 6 metre wide toucan crossing outside Deptford Park Primary school
- New mini-roundabout replaces signalised junction at Oxestalls Road to improve journey times for all road users
- Wider footways and opportunity for new urban realm at Deptford High Street
- Banning the right turn on to Evelyn Street from Watergate Street and Deptford High Street and banning the right turn in to Deptford High Street from Evelyn Street
- Changes to some bus stop locations and layouts and bus stop bypasses for cyclists
- Replacing some single yellow lines with double yellow lines along Evelyn Street and Creek Road

The enclosed map shows some of the main changes proposed. Detailed proposals and additional information, including predicted traffic impacts can be viewed at: tfl.gov.uk/cs4
Lower Road
Lower Road is adjacent to Canada Water, an area that will see major regeneration and development in the next few years. To understand how developments and future transport schemes would affect the existing road network, we have jointly commissioned a Strategic Transport Study with Southwark Council. When completed, this study will inform the design for Lower Road – ensuring that it meets the future needs of the community. Consultation on proposals for the Lower Road section of CS4 will be undertaken next year.

Public exhibitions
We will be holding public exhibitions in Greenwich, as well as in Lewisham and Southwark, where you can view the proposals, speak to members of the project team and ask questions. Details of our plans and other events can be viewed in the following ways:

- By visiting tfl.gov.uk/cs4
- At West Greenwich library, where copies have been provided for your reference
- At the following public exhibitions in Greenwich:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Alfege Church</td>
<td>3 Greenwich Church Street, SE10 9BJ</td>
<td>Tuesday 17th October</td>
<td>16:00-19:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Wolfe Primary school</td>
<td>21 Randall Place, SE10 9LA</td>
<td>Saturday 21st October</td>
<td>11:00-15:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have your say on the proposals
Your views are important to us. The responses to this consultation will help inform our decision making. To find out more and let us know what you think about our proposals, visit tfl.gov.uk/cs4. You can also tell us your views by emailing consultations@tfl.gov.uk, writing to FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATIONS, or calling 0343 222 1155.

The consultation runs from Thursday 28 September to Sunday 19 November 2017.

If you require paper copies of our plans and a response form, copies in Braille, large text or another language, please contact us using the details above.

Next steps
We will analyse and consider all responses received, and will publish our results in early 2018. Construction of the scheme would be subject to the outcome of this consultation.

Please tell us your views by Sunday 19 November 2017.

Yours faithfully,

Anna Pastore
Consultation Team
Transport for London
CS4 Overview map - sent with letters A B and C. It was also used at our consultation events
London Borough of Southwark (LBS) - Leaflet distribution area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>Grange, Livesey, Rotherhithe, South Bermondsey, Surrey Docks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area limits</td>
<td><strong>North &amp; East:</strong> River Thames; <strong>South East:</strong> Boundary with Lewisham; <strong>South:</strong> A2206, Jarrow Road, Almond Road, Blue Anchor Lane, Lucy Road, Grange Walk; <strong>West:</strong> A3, St Thomas Street, Weston Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our consultation leaflet was sent to all addresses (in total, over 34,000) within the distribution area shown in purple:
London Borough of Lewisham (LBL) - Leaflet distribution area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>Evelyn &amp; New Cross</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area limits</td>
<td><strong>North:</strong> Boundary with LBS; <strong>East:</strong> River Thames, Boundary with Greenwich; <strong>South:</strong> Creekside, Northern limits of Margaret McMillan Park, Douglas Way, Amersham Grove, Folkstone Gardens; <strong>West:</strong> Silwood Street, Boundary with Southwark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our consultation leaflet was sent to all addresses (in total, over 13,000) within the distribution area shown in purple:
Royal Borough of Greenwich (RBG) - Leaflet distribution area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>West Greenwich &amp; Peninsular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area limits</td>
<td>North: River Thames; East: Hoskins Street, Maze Hill; South: Northern limits of Greenwich Park, Nevada Street, Burney street, Greenwich High Road; West: Norman Road, Boundary with Lewisham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our consultation leaflet was sent to all addresses (in total, over 7,000) within the distribution area shown in purple:
Examples of display materials used at consultation events – CS4 proposals by sections
Proposals for section 5 (Lower Road) will be subject to a future consultation.
Examples of postcards given out at events and left at local libraries

Have your say on Cycle Superhighway 4

Artists impression

MAYOR OF LONDON

TRANSPORT FOR LONDON
EVERY JOURNEY MATTERS
Have your say on Cycle Superhighway 4
Have your say on Cycle Superhighway 4 from Tower Bridge to Greenwich

We are seeking your views on proposals to make it easier and safer to cycle and walk in Bermondsey, Rotherhithe, Deptford and Greenwich as part of Cycle Superhighway 4.

To find out more about the consultation, get details of our public drop-in sessions and to have your say:
Visit: tfl.gov.uk/cs4
Email: consultations@tfl.gov.uk
Write: FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATIONS
Call: 0343 222 1155*

Please submit your views by Sunday 19 November 2017

*Service and network charges apply.
Visit tfl.gov.uk/terms for details.
Example of text used on our consultation web page:

Below is some sample text from the landing page of the tfl.gov.uk/cs4 website:

Overview

We want your views on proposals to transform roads in Bermondsey, Rotherhithe, Deptford and Greenwich to make cycling and walking easier, safer and more appealing.

Cycle Superhighway 4 (CS4) would provide a continuous segregated cycle route between Tower Bridge and Greenwich, along with new pedestrian crossings, improved public spaces and a host of other improvements aimed at creating a more attractive environment for all users and accommodating the area’s future growth. This consultation does not include proposals for Lower Road, which will be consulted on at a later date (find out more).

CS4 would form part of London’s expanding network of Cycle Superhighways, an important part of the Mayor’s draft Transport Strategy and Healthy Streets Approach, which aim to encourage walking, cycling and public transport, making London greener, healthier and more pleasant.

Summary of proposed changes

Our proposals for CS4 include:

• Two-way segregated cycle track on Tooley Street, Jamaica Road, Evelyn Street and Creek Road, providing a dedicated space for people who want to cycle
• Five new signal-controlled pedestrian crossings and upgrades to over 20 existing pedestrian crossings, making it easier and safer to cross the road
• Building on the recent short-term improvements at Rotherhithe Roundabout by redesigning the roundabout to improve safety as part of our Safer Junctions programme.
• Installing a new eastbound bus gate on the Jamaica Road approach to Rotherhithe Roundabout, giving buses priority at the roundabout and improving bus access to Lower Road
• New and improved public spaces at Deptford High Street and Rotherhithe Roundabout, including new paving and trees
• New traffic restrictions, including banned turns on some side roads along Jamaica Road and at Deptford High Street
• Changes to some bus stop layouts and locations, including new bus stop bypasses for cyclists (find out more about bus stop bypasses)

Why are we proposing CS4?

Around 3,500 trips are already being made daily by people cycling along the A200. In addition, this route has some of the highest numbers of pedestrian numbers in London. CS4 is designed to help us meet the target set out in the Mayor’s draft Transport Strategy of changing the way people choose to travel so that, by 2041, 80
per cent of all trips in London are made by walking, cycling or public transport, up from 64 per cent today.

**Improving safety**
Safety is one of the main barriers to cycling in London. Between September 2013 and August 2016, there were 93 recorded collisions involving cyclists and 49 recorded collisions involving pedestrians along this section of the A200. Our research shows that were the route safer, more journeys could be made on foot or by cycle.

CS4 would separate cyclists from motor traffic by providing kerbed cycle tracks along its length. At major junctions, cycles would be separated from motor traffic using cycling-specific traffic light phases to reduce the risk of collisions. Our proposals also include major safety improvements at Rotherhithe Roundabout, which was identified as a priority for changes as part of our Safer Junctions programme.

**Encouraging active travel in south-east London**
Cycling is now a major mode of transport in London. There are more than 670,000 cycle trips a day in the capital, an increase of over 130 per cent since 2000. The introduction of the East-West and North-South Cycle Superhighways has seen a significant increase in cycling as a mode of transport along those routes.

An emerging network of Cycle Superhighways exists in north, south and east London, but none yet in south-east London. Our proposals would bring a high-quality cycle facility to south-east London, encouraging more people to start cycling. Our analysis shows that sections of Tooley Street and Jamaica Road are among the top one per cent of areas for cycle demand in London, while the entire CS4 route is in the top five per cent.

**Improving places**
Our proposals would help connect Bermondsey, Rotherhithe, Deptford and Greenwich, linking important amenities and facilities, making them more pleasant places to live, work, shop and spend time. We would install new seating areas and cycle parking to provide space for people to rest and spend time in these town centres, along with other improvements such as new plants and trees. Our proposals aim to create more welcoming and inclusive streets for individuals and communities to enjoy.

**Joined-up improvements to accommodate growth**
London is growing and changing, with the city's population forecast to rise from 9 million people today to 10.5 million in 2041. We must find new ways to plan London's growth, including proposals like CS4 to encourage healthy and sustainable transport. CS4 is part of a package of planned and proposed improvements aimed at helping this part of south-east London accommodate expected growth, including the regeneration of Canada Water, recent improvements made to ease congestion at
Rotherhithe Roundabout, and the proposed Rotherhithe to Canary Wharf river crossing.

Next steps

We will analyse and consider all of the responses received to the consultation, and expect to publish our response early in 2018.

For the Lower Road section of CS4, we have jointly commissioned a Strategic Transport Study with the London Borough of Southwark to understand how developments and future transport schemes would affect the existing road network. When completed, this study will inform the design for Lower Road, ensuring that it meets the future needs of the community. Consultation on proposals for Lower Road will take place at a later date.

Subject to the outcome of consultation and agreeing proposals with partner boroughs, we would aim to commence construction on CS4 in late 2018.

Have your say

- Through our consultation survey below
- By email to consultations@tfl.gov.uk
- In writing to FREEPOST TFL CONSULTATIONS using 'CS4' as the subject

Please tell us your views by Sunday 19 November 2017

Public events

We will be holding public events at which TfL and borough staff involved in the project will be available to answer your questions:

- Tuesday 3 October 3-7pm, Beormund Community Centre, 177 Abbey Street, SE1 2AN
- Thursday 5 October 3-7pm, Deptford Lounge, 9 Giffin Street, SE8 4RH
- Saturday 14 October 11am-3pm, Deptford Lounge, 9 Giffin Street, SE8 4RH
- Tuesday 17 October 4-7pm, St Alfege Church Hall, 3 Greenwich Church Street, SE10 9BJ
- Saturday 21 October 11am-3pm, James Wolfe Primary School, 21 Randall Place, SE10 9LA
- Wednesday 25 October 3pm-7pm, The Finnish Church, 33 Albion Street, SE16 7JG
- Saturday 4 November 11am-3pm, The Finnish Church, 33 Albion Street, SE16 7JG

Our consultation material will be on display at the following locations from Thursday 28 September for the duration of the consultation.

- Canada Water Library: 21 Surrey Quays Road, SE16 7AR
- Blue Anchor Library: Market Place, Southwark Park Road, SE16 3UQ
- Deptford Lounge: 9 Giffin Street, SE8 4RH
- West Greenwich Library: 146 Greenwich High Road, SE10 8NN
TfL published a press release to publicise the CS4 consultation to national, regional, local and specialist media. Below is a selection of the coverage CS4 received:


http://www.london-se1.co.uk/news/view/9396

http://www.cityam.com/272869/mapped-london-mayor-sadiq-khan-unveils-plans-cycle

https://lcc.org.uk/pages/cycle-superhighways

https://londonist.com/london/transport/south-east-london-s-getting-a-new-cycle-superhighway

http://road.cc/content/news/229992-sadiq-khan-unveils-plans-new-cycle-superhighway-south-east-london


Email sent to stakeholder organisations

Dear Stakeholder,

We would like your views on proposals to transform roads in Bermondsey, Rotherhithe, Deptford and Greenwich to make cycling and walking easier, safer and more appealing.

Cycle Superhighway 4 (CS4) would provide a continuous segregated cycle route between Tower Bridge and Greenwich, as well as new pedestrian crossings, better public spaces, and a host of other improvements aimed at creating a more attractive environment for everyone, and accommodating the area’s future growth.

This consultation does not include proposals for Lower Road, which will be consulted on at a later date.

CS4 would form part of London’s expanding network of Cycle Superhighways. These are an important element of the Mayor’s draft Transport Strategy and Healthy Streets Approach, which aim to encourage walking, cycling and public transport and make London greener, healthier and more pleasant.

Our proposals include:

- Two-way segregated cycle track on Tooley Street, Jamaica Road, Evelyn Street and Creek Road, providing dedicated space for anyone who wants to cycle
- Five new signal-controlled pedestrian crossings and upgrades to over 20 existing pedestrian crossings, making it easier and safer to cross the road
- Building on the recent short-term improvements at Rotherhithe Roundabout by redesigning the roundabout to improve safety as part of our Safer Junctions programme
- A new eastbound bus gate on the Jamaica Road approach to Rotherhithe Roundabout, giving buses priority at the roundabout and providing better bus access into Lower Road
- New and improved public spaces at Deptford High Street and Rotherhithe Roundabout, including new paving and trees
- New traffic restrictions, including banned turns on some side roads along Jamaica Road and at Deptford High Street
- Changes to some bus stop layouts and locations, including new bus stop bypasses for cyclists

For more information and to give us your views, please visit tfl.gov.uk/cs4. You have until Sunday 19 November 2017 to respond.

We will be holding public events where staff involved in the project will be available to answer your questions. See the website for details of times and locations.

Yours faithfully,

Jay Daisi
Consultation Team
Transport for London
Appendix E: Stakeholders contacted at consultation launch

In some instances, more than one person at each organisation was contacted at the start of the consultation, but the organisation is named only once in this table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation Name</th>
<th>Address Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abellio West London Ltd t/a Abellio Surrey</td>
<td>Living Streets - Kings Cross (Camden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access in London</td>
<td>Living Streets - Merton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action on Disability and Work UK</td>
<td>Living Streets - Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action on Hearing Loss</td>
<td>Living Streets - Tower Hamlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addison Lee</td>
<td>Living Streets - Wandsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Concern London</td>
<td>Living Streets Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age UK</td>
<td>Living Streets London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Industries UK</td>
<td>Living Streets Southwark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albion Primary School</td>
<td>Local Government Ombudsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALDI Chelmsford</td>
<td>London Ambulance Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Salter Primary School</td>
<td>London Association of Funeral Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alive in Space Landscape and Urban Design Studio</td>
<td>London Bike Hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group</td>
<td>London Borough of Barking and Dagenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance Healthcare</td>
<td>London Borough of Bexley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alzheimer's Society</td>
<td>London Borough of Camden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amersham Vale Medical Centre</td>
<td>London Borough of Croydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Travel Ltd</td>
<td>London Borough of Ealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel London</td>
<td>London Borough of Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Frye Ltd</td>
<td>London Borough of Hammersmith &amp; Fulham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety Care</td>
<td>London Borough of Havering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll</td>
<td>London Borough of Hillingdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos</td>
<td>London Borough of Hounslow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arriva London North Ltd</td>
<td>London Borough of Islington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artesian Health Centre</td>
<td>London Borough of Lewisham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS Watson (Health and Beauty UK)</td>
<td>London Borough of Merton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asda</td>
<td>London Borough of Richmond-Upon-Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Peoples Disabilities Alliance</td>
<td>London Borough of Southwark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspire</td>
<td>London Borough of Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of British Drivers</td>
<td>London Borough of Tower Hamlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Car Fleet Operators</td>
<td>London Borough of Wandsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of International &amp; Express Couriers</td>
<td>London Borough of Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Town Centre Management</td>
<td>London Business Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT Coaches t/a Abbey Travel</td>
<td>London Cab Drivers Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATOC</td>
<td>London Chamber of Commerce and Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacon's College</td>
<td>London City Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Street Quarter</td>
<td>London City Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankside Residents' Forum</td>
<td>London Climate Change Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Councils</td>
<td>London Cycling Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Bankside BID</td>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Enfield)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Transport</td>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Lewisham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexleyheath BID</td>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Southwark)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHS bikeability</td>
<td>London Cycling Campaign (Wandsworth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besson Street Residents</td>
<td>London Cycling Campaign Greenwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidvest Logistics</td>
<td>London Duck Tours Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeworks</td>
<td>London European Partnership for Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BikeXcite</td>
<td>London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackheath Joint Working Party</td>
<td>London Fire Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Triangle Buses Limited</td>
<td>London First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blythe Hill Fields Residents</td>
<td>London Gypsies &amp; Travellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Cycling Officers Group</td>
<td>London Older People's Strategy Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brains Trust</td>
<td>London Omnibus Traction Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brakes Group</td>
<td>London Private Hire Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakspears Road Project</td>
<td>London Region National Pensioners Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood Community Transport</td>
<td>London Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewery Logistics Group</td>
<td>London Strategic Health Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewing, Food &amp; Beverage Industry Suppliers Association</td>
<td>London Suburban Taxi-drivers' Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Association of Removers</td>
<td>London Tourist Coach Operators Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Beer &amp; Pub Association (BBPA)</td>
<td>London TravelWatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Cycling</td>
<td>London United Busways Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Land</td>
<td>London Visual Impairment Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Medical Association</td>
<td>London Wildlife Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Motorcycle Federation</td>
<td>Look Ahead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Motorcyclists Federation</td>
<td>Loomis UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Property Federation</td>
<td>Love Wimbledon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley BID</td>
<td>LPCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>LTDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucks Cycle Training</td>
<td>Lupus UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burney Street Practice</td>
<td>Marathon Science School (independent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C T Plus C I C</td>
<td>Marks &amp; Spencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Town unlimited</td>
<td>Martin-Brower UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign for Better Transport</td>
<td>Matthew Pennycook MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal &amp; River Trust London</td>
<td>McNicholas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canary Wharf Group</td>
<td>Mencap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital City School Sport Partnership</td>
<td>Metrobus Ltd,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carers Information Service</td>
<td>Metroline Ltd,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Pidgeon LAM</td>
<td>Metropolitan Police Heathrow Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Russell LAM</td>
<td>Metropolitan Police Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carousel</td>
<td>MIND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavendish School Southwark</td>
<td>MITIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI-London</td>
<td>Mobile Cycle Training Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCG Greenwich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Cemex
Central London CTC
Central London Forward
Central London Freight Quality Partnership
Central London NHS Trust
CGP London The Gallery
Charlton Rail user Group
Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport (CILT)
Chauffeur and Executive Association
Cheapside BID
Cherry Parker
City Bikes (Vauxhall Walk)
City Hope Church
City of London
City of London Police
City Sprint
Clapham Transport Users Group
Clear Channel UK
Collect Plus
Compass School Southwark
Computer Cab
Confederation of Business Industry
Confederation of Passenger Transport
Councillor Aidan Smith
Councillor Anood Al Samerai
Councillor Ben Johnson
Councillor Bill Williams
Councillor Brenda Dacres
Councillor Catherine Dale
Councillor Chris Lloyd
Councillor Damian O'Brien
Councillor David Hubber
Councillor David Michael
Councillor Denise Hyland
Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald
Councillor Eliza Mann
Councillor Evelyn Akoto
Councillor Hamish McCallum
Councillor Helen Dennis
Councillor Ian Wingfield
Councillor James Okosun
Councillor Jamie Milne
Councillor Joe Dromey
Councillor John Coughlin
Mode Transport
Mornington Surgery
Morrison's Supermarkets
Most Holy Trinity RC Church
Motorcycle Action Group
Motorcycle Industry Association
MS Society
National Autistic Society
National Children's Bureau
National Express Ltd
National Grid
National Motorcycle Council
National Pensioners Forum
Navin Shah LAM
Neil Coyle MP
New Cross Gate Trust
New Mill Street Surgery
New West End Company
NHS London
No Panic
Northbank BID
NWEC
Ocean Youth Connexions
Office Depot
Olivet Deptford Baptist Church
On Your Bike Cycle Training
Our Hither Green Community Association
Our Lady of the Assumption, Deptford
Our Lady of the Immaculate Conception
Paddington Now
Pan-London Dementia Alliance
Parcelforce
Park Medical Centre
Parkinson's UK
Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety
Passenger Focus
Peabody Residents
Philip Kemp cycle training
Planning Design
Port of London Authority
Potters Field Park
Private Hire Board
PureGym London Bermondsey
Purley BID
Disability Alliance
Disability Rights UK
Disabled Go
Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee
Dogs for Good
DPD group UK
DPTAC
Dyslexia Action
Ealing BID
East and South East London Thames Gateway Transport Partnership
East London Bus and Coach Company Ltd
East London Vision
Polestar Travel
EDF Energy
Ehlers Danlos Support UK
ELB Partners
English Heritage
Ensign bus
Epsom Coaches / Quality Line
Euromix Concrete
European Dyslexia Reference Information Centre
Euston Town
Evelyn Community Centre (New Cross area)
Evolution Cycle Training
Evolution Quarter Residents’ Association
Farringdon and Clerkenwell
Federation of Refugees from Vietnam In Lewisham (FORVIL)
Federation of Small Businesses
Federation of Wholesale Distributors (FWD)
Finnish Church in London
Florence Eshalomi LAM
Folkestone Gardens
Forest Hill Traders Association
Fowler Welch Ltd
Freight Transport Association
Friends of Capital Transport
Friends of Southwark Park
Friends of the Earth
Future Inclusion
Gatwick Airport
GBM Drivers
Geoffrey Brighty
South East London PCT
South East London Vision
South Greenwich Forum
South Herts Plus Cycle Training
Southbank BID
Southwark CCG
Southwark Cyclists
Southwark Park Primary School
Southwark Park Sports Centre
Southwark Safer Transport Team
Southwark Social Services - Vietnamese
Southwark Travellers’ Action Group
Spa Medical Practice
Space Syntax
Spokes Cycling Instruction
St Alfege CE Church
St Alfege with St Peter's CoE Primary
St Germans Terrace Association
St James' Church
St James’ CoE Primary School
St John’s Catholic Primary School
St Joseph’s RC Primary School (Deptford)
St Joseph’s RC Primary School (Surrey Quays)
St Katharine's Vicarage
St Mary Magdalen Bermondsey
St Mary's and St Paul's CoE Primary School
St Michael’s Catholic College - secondary
St Nicholas CE Deptford
St Paul's RC Church Deptford
St Peter & The Guardian Angels RC Station to Station
Steve O'Connell LAM
Stratford Original
Stroke Association
Sullivan Bus and Coach
Surrey Docks Farm London
Surrey Docks Health Centre
Sustrans
Sutton Centre for Voluntary Sector
Sutton mobility forum
Team London Bridge
Technicolour Tyre Company
GeoPost UK
GLA Strategy Access Panel members
GMB Drivers
Gnewt Cargo
Golden Tours (Transport) Ltd, Grange Road Practice
Greater London Authority
Greater London Forum for Older People
Greenwich CCG
Greenwich Safer Transport Team
Greenwich Society
Greggs
Grinling Gibbons Primary School
Grove Medical Centre
Guide Dogs for the Blind Association
HA Boyse and Son
Haddonhall Resident's TMO
Hampstead BID
Harriet Harman MP
Harrow Macular Disease Society
Harrow Town Centre
Hatton Gardens
Health Poverty Action
Hearing Dogs UK
Heart of London
Heathrow Airport Consultative Committee
Herne Hill Society
Holy Trinity, Rotherhithe
House of Commons
House on the Rock International Church
HR Richmond Ltd t/a Quality Line
IDAG
Ilford Bid
In Midtown
In Streatham
In Inclusion London
Independent Disability Advisory Group
Institute for Sustainability
Institute of Advanced Motorists
Institute of Civil Engineers ICE
Institute Of Couriers
Invicta Primary School
James Bikeability
James Wolfe Primary School and Centre for the Deaf
Joanne McCartney LAM
Thames Water
Thamesmead Business Services
Thamesmead online
The AA
The Arch Climbing Wall
The Association of Guide Dogs for the Blind
The Big Bus Company Ltd
The Blackheath Society
The British Dyslexia Association
The British Motorcyclists' Federation
The Canal & River Trust
The Co-operative Group
The Corbett Society
The Driver-Guides Association
The Fitzrovia Partnership
The Langton Way Resident Association
The Original Tour
The Royal Parks
The Telegraph Hill Society
The Westcombe Society
This is Clapham
Thomas Pocklington Trust
Tidemill Academy - secondary
TKMaxx
TNT
Tom Copley LAM
Tour Guides
Tower Bridge Primary School
Tower Transit Operations
TPH for Heathrow Airport
Tradeteam
Trailblazers, Muscular Dystrophy UK
Transport Focus
Transport for All
Travis Perkins Plc
Try Twickenham
Tyssen Community School Cycle Training
Uber
UK Power Networks
UK Vietnamese Network
Unions Together
Unite Union
University College London
University bus Ltd / UNO
UPS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Lewis Partnership</th>
<th>Urban Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Committee on Mobility for Disabled People</td>
<td>Vandeome Cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Committee on Mobility of Blind and Partially Sighted People (JCMBPS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Mobility Unit</td>
<td>Vauxhall One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Prince LAM</td>
<td>Vicky Foxcroft MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Group</td>
<td>Victoria BID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Kids Christian Primary School - independent</td>
<td>Victoria Business Improvement District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingfisher Medical Centre</td>
<td>Virtual Norwood Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston First</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIPPA</td>
<td>Vision 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuehne + Nagel</td>
<td>Walk London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laing O Rourke</td>
<td>Wallace Health Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth Cyclists</td>
<td>Wandsworth BID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCDC</td>
<td>Wandsworth mobility forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len Duvall LAM</td>
<td>Warburtons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Cheshire Disability</td>
<td>Waterloo Quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Clinical Commissioning Group</td>
<td>Westminster Cyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Indo Chinese Community</td>
<td>Wheels for Wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Safer Transport Team</td>
<td>Whitbread Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Whizz-Kidz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenced Private Hire Car Association</td>
<td>Willow Lane BID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenced Taxi Drivers Association</td>
<td>Wilson James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Streets - Brentwood</td>
<td>Wilsons Cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Streets - Islington</td>
<td>Wincanton Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wolseley UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young Lewisham and Greenwich Cyclists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>