

## Popley to Chineham District Centre Accessibility Improvements



Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the feasibility study by Atkins of the above cycle route.

### Option 3 preferred

There is definitely a need for this route by all cyclists. We do not agree with either option 1 or 2, option 3 with important modifications is preferred. The route could benefit local businesses and we would hope and expect that local businesses will encourage their workers to use this route.

The new ramp on the opposite side of the A33, and associated Toucan Crossing have completely changed the viability of this route. This route will be very useful for many journeys, giving access to Daneshill (work) from Popley. It is also the most direct route between Lychpit and Chineham Business Park - cycling will be significantly quicker than driving.

### Modification needed to Option 3

The quality of the design is crucial to the success of this project. The devil is in the detail.

#### Good quality cycle facilities:

1. do not put cyclists and pedestrians into conflict – bicycles should be treated as vehicles not as pedestrians<sup>1</sup> LCDS chap 1.
2. offer real benefits to the cyclist. ( Lidl's and Bilton road section exemplify this)
3. benefit both experienced cyclists and encourage beginners (Lidl's and Bilton road sections exemplify this).
4. Go all the way, do not stop short of the destination (in this case all the way to Tesco's). End of route signs and cyclist dismount indicate a poor quality route (TfL cycle design standards and LTN 1/12 para 6.24 and LTN 2/08 3.1.3). The end of a route is the destination, therefore direction signs are essential to either direct a cyclist on to the carriageway or indicate where a footpath continues. LCDS 6.1.20
5. Signage should be minimal, but direction signs are essential (LTN 2/08 3.1.3). The borough policy is to declutter the highway infrastructure. Surface markings rather than posts are safer.

<sup>1</sup> London cycling design standards –draft consultation June 2014 chap 1

6. Bollards and barriers should only be used if there is a proven need (Sustrans, LTN 1/12 § 6.6, London Cycle Design Standards LCDS 1.13, 3.2.41 ). They can drive pedestrians and cyclists closer together and increase conflict. They are dangerous and have caused injury or death. They make the path unusable at night and preclude people with non standard bicycles from using the route (disobeys the Public Sector Equality Duty).
7. transition or merge between carriageway and footway/cycleway should be safe, smooth and convenient without difficult manoeuvres which can unbalance the bike and cause a fall, especially if the cycle is heavily laden or is carrying a child which raises the centre of gravity. (see attached photos and LCDS 3.2.38)
8. cycle routes are not “self contained”, they must be integrated into the entire highway system. (Wade road comments)

## **Review by section**

### **Lidl**

Path beside Lidl store should be widened.

Some consider this already a shared use path.

It is a useful link (and before the new crossing and ramp on the A33, this was the only practical way for most cyclists to get to the where Lidl now is).

### **Path beside Lidl, under railway, to Bilton Road**

Path needs widening to at least 2m.

The plans show this path as 2.0m, but it is only 1.7 - 1.8m, with an adjacent fence on the South (‘Go Outdoors’) side. It is also good practice to increase the width by .5m for each side if a path is bounded by a kerb, fence or wall. This is normally too narrow for a shared use path, ideally it should be increased to 3.0m. There are sharp corners with poor visibility near the subway. There appears to be space to the side to widen the path, including the corners.

Although the subway is 2m wide, this is less than the recommended 3m, cycling should still be allowed. Cyclists should be encouraged to make their own decision whether to dismount or not with non standard signs such as “cycle with care, narrow path”. A cyclist walking his bike takes up more space and obstructs the route more than a mounted cyclist proceeding slowly.

There are a pair of concrete bollards where the path meets Bilton Road. There is also another pair of concrete bollards on the entrance to the subway (Bilton Road side). These serve no purpose, and should be removed. But the bollards are far enough apart to cycle through. A middle bollard must not be added (plans do not show this, but other cycle routes have been made dangerous by additional bollards).

The footpath through the subway is ‘not a public footpath’ (Railways Act) according to the sign. Presumably Network Rail is being consulted.

## **Bilton road/Wade road junction**

It is accepted that the crossings here are not the final solution. However there are still improvements needed in the design.

Would a zebra be possible instead of the uncontrolled pedestrian crossing? This would increase safety and priority for pedestrians. Alternatively consider LCDS: “4.2.20 These ‘courtesy’ crossings do not give priority over vehicles on the carriageway. However, introduction of give-way signs and markings for motorists with a raised table would give formal priority to crossing pedestrians or cyclists without the need for a zebra crossing.

There must be the assumption that cyclists may wish to turn left or right in to Wade road. They may be travelling towards Tescos (shopping) or in the opposite direction towards Houndmills (commuting to work).

It is essential that there is easy transfer between carriageway and footway/cycleway and that it should only include one road crossing not two.

### Left turn into Wade road

2 options should be provided

- on road turn left from road into road. (no changes needed)
- convert footway to shared use a few metres before Wade road and continue as far as the crossing.

### Right turn into Wade road

The present uncontrolled crossing is in the “wrong place” for this manoeuvre, it involves too many changes of direction. No facilities are provided.

### Straight ahead along Wade road

- Cyclists wishing to leave the Wade road cycleway and continue towards Houndmills. There needs to be a wide dropped kerb (flush) so that cyclists can join the carriageway at 30° to 45° rather than execute a sharp right 90° followed by a sharp left 90°. (see attached photos). A short stretch of cycle lane or a platform on the road before the merge would slow traffic.
- Cyclists coming from Houndmills wishing to join the cycleway contraflow. They will need to join the with flow cycle route. In order to avoid the dangerous and difficult manoeuvre of moving out into the centre of the road to turn sharp 90° left then sharp 90° right, the present shared cycleway (mauve on the map, shared cycleway not within HCC boundary) should have a dropped kerb flush with the highway or a sloped kerb for its full length until the crossing point. The merge will then be at ~ 45 °.

## **Wade road**

### **Both carriageway and footway conversion must be safe for cycling**

## Onroad issues

On a scale of 1 to 5 (5 = extremely hostile) for cycle friendliness Wade road probably ranks about 3. At some times of the day it is relatively quiet and there is sufficient space for motorists to safely overtake cyclists. It is therefore quite acceptable for many confident or experienced cyclists. The most challenging areas are the junction at the Binfields road end and the roundabout at the other end.

There is a possible argument for an uphill slow lane for cyclists in one section. There is insufficient space for onroad protected cycle lanes of recommended 2m. width on both sides of the road which option would cater for all types of cyclist.

The nervous cyclist will be deterred from using the carriageway and typically feels safer and more confident on the footway, despite issues of safety and conflict. The route needs to be as continuous as possible. We would therefore accept a converted footway, despite its many disadvantages listed below. We stress that conditions on the road for cycling are not made more difficult by pinchpoints and narrowings. For this reason a crossing for pedestrians using a zebra is preferable to a split crossing with an island. Central hatching bordered by a dashed white line (i.e. not mandatory) is preferred to solid street furniture – it provides emergency space for cars to overtake cyclists as well as keeping opposing lanes of traffic apart on blind corners.

## shared use path problems

If the pavement is well used by pedestrians, there will be conflict, especially on the downhill section.

South bound - i.e. downhill most cyclists will be going too fast to safely use a shared use path. (this is the case with Alencon link cycleway)

Loss of priority at 3 locations, including at the bottom of hill, on a corner.

Indirect crossing at this junction - 3 near 90deg turns - not straight.

No provision for cycle access from path to/from Onslow Close. (a very wide dropped kerb is needed)

No provision for cycle access from path to/from Absolutely Karting (next on from Onslow Close). (very wide dropped kerb needed)

No access to businesses on the other side of the road

Many cyclists will want to continue along Wade road, not turn into Bilton road, they will then stay on the pavement unless there is a quality merge with the carriageway.

On road cyclists travelling to Tescos will want to join the cycle way at the Gt Binfields road junction and the pedestrian crossing here has the wrong alignment to make this possible.

Many confident cyclists will not use this section because to quote one cyclist:.

Southbound - compared with on-road cycling: a path will be slower (cannot safely do 20+mph downhill, and considering the corners), loss of priority at 3 locations, including the bottom of a hill!!!! - meaning would you have to almost stop in case there was traffic turning into or out of the side road, camber is likely to be adverse.

Northbound - going slower up-hill, so less of a cost to using a cycle path, and would also mean not holding up traffic.

If travelling uphill to a business on the opposite side of the road to the cycle path it will mean crossing the road twice.

### Test cycle rides

This cyclist conducted a couple of 'test' cycle rides, downwards from the traffic lights on Great Binfields Road) to opposite the Bilton Road entrance. Cycling at a responsible speed on the pavement, slowing for the 3 side entrances, took 1 1/2 minutes. Cycling on the road (reasonable speed, but not racing), same journey, took slightly less than 1 minute. So using the proposed pavement when there are no pedestrians present will increase time by 50%. Difference in the other direction will be less. Hazards include road crossings, braking for the road crossing and sharp bends. There are sharp the bends on this section of road, they are even sharper when using the pavement.

### **Wade road/Great Binfields junction**

We accept that there will eventually be a cycle right turn here and continuation into the Chineham centre. However the likelihood is that cyclists will continue cycling across the junction. Instead "end of route" signs there should be cyclist dismount and pedestrian direction signs to the centre. It is essential that this section is made cyclable as soon as possible. A chain is only as strong as its weakest link, a cycle route without a destination is not acceptable.

Cyclists on road bound for Tescos need to cross Wade road to reach the converted footway and reach the signalised crossing. They cannot use the pedestrian crossing, it is too difficult to manoeuvre to get on to it. This needs redesigning.

Short linking path into the Chineham Centre is currently only 1.5m wide. This is too narrow for two cyclists to pass. This needs to be increased to 3.0m. Need space to allow some cyclists to turn into the access road. As with all crossings there needs to be adequate space to wait before crossing, while someone else may be wanting to enter the path.

### **Conclusion**

#### **Option 3 preferred**

There is definitely a need for this route by all cyclists. We do not agree with either option 1 or 2, option 3 with important modifications is preferred. The route could benefit local businesses and we would hope and expect that local businesses will encourage their workers to use this route.

Heather Rainbow

Representing

CTC North Hampshire – part of the national cycling charity representative

Cycle Basingstoke – helping people cycle in the borough

45 Buckland avenue  
Basingstoke  
RG22 6JA

[heather@rainbowramsey.plus.com](mailto:heather@rainbowramsey.plus.com)

01256 322581

Note:

LCDS London cycle design standards references are to the 2014 draft revision of the 2005 version.