Proposals for alterations to Lambeth Bridge Northern Roundabout

Response from CTC

CTC, the national cycling charity, was founded in 1878. CTC has 70,000 members and supporters, provides a range of information and legal services to cyclists, organises cycling events, and represents the interests of cyclists and cycling on issues of public policy.

Cycle usage on Lambeth Bridge North Roundabout

Department for Transport traffic counts are available for three of the four arms of the junction. The 2011 counts for the approach roads to and from the junction are:

2011	Abingdon Street	Lambeth Bridge	Millbank
Cyclists	3,092	4,484	3,905
HGVs	1,063	848	1,144
Cars/taxis	16,681	20,669	18,260
All vehicles	28,225	34,824	31,857
Cycle % of all	11%	13%	12%
Increase in cycle use since 2000	28%	233%	489%
Increase in motor traffic since 2000	-16%	-11%	-22%

Motor vehicle use has been in decline on all three junction arms, whereas cycle use has been increasing.

Casualties on Lambeth Bridge North Roundabout

The Department for Transport's published database for cycle casualties reveal that, over the 6 years from 2005-2010, there were 39 casualties on the roundabout, of which 27 (69%) were cyclists.

Of the 39 casualties, 2 were serious, both cyclists.

Design of the Roundabout

The current design of the roundabout is extremely hostile for cyclists, encouraging high speeds and inappropriate overtaking manoeuvres.

Our preferred option in this situation would be to redesign the layout of the roundabout along 'continental' lines – that is, with a single lane roundabout and small curve radii single exits and entry lanes. Such a design is recommended in the London Cycle Design Standards, section 5.4.5/5.4.13.[i] We acknowledge that this design is more suitable for junctions with lower traffic volumes, but we suggest that this is acceptable given the gradual decline in motor traffic on all three approaching

arms and the absence of any major junctions in the immediate vicinity of any of the junction arms.

Whilst we understand that the London Cycling Campaign have proposed fully segregated cycle tracks around the roundabout, we feel this is sensible only if priority over entering and exiting traffic can be provided to cyclists. This could be achieved by extending the zebra raised table to the mouth of each exit and entry way, enabling priority cycle crossings to be provided in accordance with TfL and DfT guidance.[ii] Dutch guidance on the provision of cycle tracks at roundabouts is clear that cyclists must have right of way in these circumstances.[iii]

TfL's proposed solution

We strongly disagree with the proposal to deposit cyclists onto a 'shared use' footway before and after the roundabout. Given that very few of the current users are likely to use such a fiddly and inconvenient means of negotiating the roundabout, most are still likely to use the roundabout itself, a point it seems TfL has acknowledged by the provision of Superhighway markings on the roundabout itself.

Given the high proportion of crashes that involve cyclists on this roundabout, we feel that the merely cosmetic changes proposed by TfL will do little to improve user safety and we urge a more fundamental redesign of the geometry of this junction takes place.

The sole aspect of TfL's design that we believe to be acceptable is the placing of the existing zebra crossings on humps. This measure should help to reduce entry and exit speeds from the roundabout.

Current regulations do not permit cyclists to use zebra crossings. Although TfL's observations have previously found drivers do give way to cyclists on zebras, we do not think it acceptable to use these as priority crossings for cyclists until regulations change to formalise this approach. However, as explained above, the extension of raised tables to the very edge of the circulating lane may allow priority crossings to be provided if the roundabout was redesigned to include fully segregated tracks.

CTC
October 2012

---

[i] TfL, 2007. *London Cycle Design Standards.* p 97, 100
[ii] *ibid.* 5.5.1
[iii] CROW, 2007. *Design manual for bicycle traffic.* p 202