Recommendations:

That the Committee considers the issues detailed in this report and recommends to the Cabinet Member for Planning and Traffic Management that he:

1. Notes the results of the informal consultation carried out in November 2009 on the proposed cycle scheme in Coombe Lane on the north side between the existing skew arch and Raynes Park Station as shown on Drawing No. Z71-135-09 displayed and as attached as Appendix 1;

2. Agrees to the implementation of the un-segregated cycle track on the south side of Coombe Lane between No 9 Station Buildings eastwards to link to the existing facilities at the Skew Arch;

3. Agrees to either:
   a) **OPTION 1** - the undertaking of a formal consultation to introduce a new Toucan crossing on the north side of Raynes Park Bridge at its junction with Coombe Lane as shown in Appendix 1 OR
   b) **OPTION 2** - the conversion of the existing Pelican crossing by the Skew Arch to a Toucan crossing that will allow the existing crossing movement using the central island to be retained for shared use (pedestrians and cyclists) as shown on displayed drawing number Z71-135-13.

4. Agrees that the Head of Street Scene & Waste is given delegated authority to consider any comments received in relation to the statutory notice for the Toucan crossing proposals set out in 3 above and decides the appropriate action.

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to bring to the Cabinet Member’s and the Street Management Advisory Committee’s attention the results of a consultation exercise carried out in November 2009 on a revised cycle scheme proposals. This was in response to a resolution at the June 2008 SMAC
meeting that officers redesign the scheme to avoid loss of trees and to reduce overall scheme costs.

1.2. The scheme presented to Committee in June 2008 has been revised and the revised proposals provide a similar cycle facility without the need to acquire network rail land that involved tree removal. The scheme cost has also been significantly reduced. There are two options available for consideration.

1.3. This report seeks approval:

a) to the creation of an un-segregated shared use footway on the southern side of Coombe Lane from a point outside No. 9 Coombe Lane to the existing shared use facility at the Skew Arch.

b) to proceed with the undertaking of a statutory consultation on a Toucan crossing facility (Option 1 or 2) to maintain a continuous cycle facility north of Raynes Park Bridge between Station Buildings and the Skew Arch. Two options have been provided in this report one of which does not require additional traffic signals in Raynes Park.

2 DETAILS

London Cycle Network - London Wide Context

2.1 The introduction of a London Cycle Network (LCN) is now a common aim of all 33 London Authorities. Their commitment to introduce measures to provide a viable London wide network of cycle routes is fully supported and funded by the London Mayor and Transport for London. The aim of the LCN is to encourage cycling, make travel by cycle easier, safe and comfortable by providing a conspicuous network of routes that link local centres and provide for longer distance as well as shorter journeys.

2.2 The Government maintains that having an environment conducive to cycling is a pre-condition to encouraging people to undertake more "active travel" and therefore encouraging modal shift. Local Implementation Plans will require local authorities to place greater emphasis on cycling and creating the correct infrastructure for cycling is a major part of the equation.

2.3 The London Cycle Network currently comprises of a wide range of measures to assist cyclists including: cycle lanes on main roads; protected crossings; signed back streets; gaps in road closures; contra-flow cycle lanes and shared use paths in parks and open spaces. The network will help cyclists to circumvent busy main roads and provide extra protection where heavily trafficked streets and busy junctions are unavoidable. There are a number of barrier locations around London where TfL and most boroughs acknowledge that there will be demanding solutions required to facilitate cyclists and costs for developing.

2.4 Raynes Park town centre is on the alignment of one of London's strategic cycle routes (Link149 of the LCN+ Network). Transport for London has identified the link between the end of the existing Coombe Lane cycle track and the Skew Arch as a “Barrier Scheme” and is, therefore, identified as a difficult scheme to achieve. The proposals contained in this report have
been discussed with TfL who has reluctantly accepted the principle of the
dismount section as set out in paragraph 2.6 below.

2.5 Scheme Details

The proposed scheme is shown on plan attached as Appendix 1 and
displayed drawing No. Z71-135-09. It comprises of two key elements:

a) **Unsegregated cycle track between No. 9 Station Buildings, Coombe Lane and the Skew Arch via Raynes Park Bridge.** The cycle track will continue across Raynes Park Bridge up to the Skew arch to form a continuous link with the existing cycle facilities in the Skew Arch where it will link to the existing cycle network and also up to Wyke Road. This latter link, as well as linking Wyke Road could potentially lead to a future upgrade of the footpath link between Raynes Park and Wimbledon for which LIP funding is currently in place. The link, however, will not be continuous in front of the station entrance.

b) **OPTION 1 - The provision of a Toucan crossing in Coombe Lane north of Raynes Park Bridge.** This option (shown in Appendix 1) provides a new pedestrian / cycle crossing facility on the north side of Raynes Park Bridge to enable safer and more convenient access to and from the Skew arch. The signals will operate on demand, that is to say that traffic would only be stopped when a pedestrian or cyclist push the button to call the crossing facility at the Toucan. If the Toucan facility is not called then the junction will operate as it does at present. To safely facilitate traffic movements, including pedestrians, the kerb line on the north side of Raynes Park bridge will need to be modified. This involves creating wider footways on both sides of the new crossing. It will also significantly improve the visibility of oncoming traffic when crossing at the proposed Toucan crossing from the west side.

Option 1 will create a new crossing point on the east side (coming from the Skew arch) where currently pedestrian-deterrent cobles are in place. The visibility from this side is currently made difficult by the presence of the bridge abutment and therefore the kerb line would need to be adjusted to provide as much visibility as possible.

The main benefit of option 1 is that it will provide a controlled crossing point north of Raynes Park Bridge and would cater for existing and newly generated movements along the proposed widened southern footway. The negative impact include, possible occasional local traffic delay; add to the street clutter and would rely on pedestrians and cyclist to waite for a green man as oppose to trying to cross the road.

**OPTION 2 - Retain and improve the existing uncontrolled crossing point to the central island and convert the existing Pelican crossing by the Skew Arch to a Toucan.** Under this option the existing crossing pattern across Raynes Park Bridge (north side) is retained. The crossing
movement to the central island would be improved as the widened southern footway would result in an improved visibility between crossing pedestrians and vehicles approaching from under the bridge. The island would be widened by approximately 1m on its northern side. This would allow the introduction of a shared use facility (pedestrians and cyclists) within the central island and would enable the conversion of the existing crossing point (Pelican crossing) to a Toucan crossing which in turn would create a continuous route from Station Buildings.

One of the main advantage of Option 2 (shown on displayed drawing number Z71-135-13) is that it would not require a new set of traffic signals. This in turn would reduce costs and would maintain the existing crossing pattern where pedestrians are only required to cross narrow sections of carriageway with only one direction of traffic.

2.6 Cyclist currently travelling south through the Cattle Arch do not have to dismount until they become close to the tunnel entrance. In the interest of reducing potential conflict between pedestrians and cyclist, the appropriate tools would be put in place so that on approaching the end of the existing Coombe Lane cycle track, cyclist wishing to proceed eastwards towards the Skew Arch or southwards towards Grand Drive would be required to dismount.

2.7 Transport for London has agreed that the signals through Raynes Park should be linked. This will help smooth traffic flow through the gyratory and would enable the Toucan crossing to operate at a time that would minimise overall delay to the network. TfL has agreed that this facility would be available for option 1 and officers are seeking approval for linking the traffic signals in Raynes Park for option 2 even though no new signals are proposed under this option. On balance, there should be an overall benefit to the network. Also, TfL will be asked to include Raynes Park on its future SCOOT programme. SCOOT is a demand responsive computer controlled system that generally creates up to 10% improvement in capacity of the road network.

2.8 Overall the scheme should reduce the cycle movements and potential conflict with pedestrians who currently use the very narrow Cattle Arch (approx 3.4m wide) - a high number of pedestrians use this arch particularly when trains arrive at the station. The proposals would permit those cyclists travelling to and from Kingston Road to use the much wider and less used Skew Arch to the east, which has an existing 2-way segregated cycle track.

3 INFORMAL CONSULTATION

3.1. Following the June 2008 Committee resolution, the proposals were revised to provide a similar cycle facility without the need to acquire network rail land involving tree removal. The scheme cost has also been significantly reduced.

3.2. A public consultation on the proposed measures was carried out between 20th November 2009 and 4th December 2009. This exercise was done alongside the wider Public Realm consultation for Raynes Park to ensure the cycle scheme is consistent with and would not preclude any future,
aspirations for improving the street scene in Raynes Park. Whilst this consultation exercise was undertaken with a single scheme option, this report sets out an alternative option that has been considered in response to concerns expressed about additional traffic signals in Raynes Park and is consistent with proposals being considered as part of the Public Realm development for Raynes Park.

3.3 The consultation exercise involved the delivery of the consultation document comprising of a description of the revised scheme, a ‘pre-paid’ reply card (attached as Appendix 2) and a plan (attached as Appendix 1). 1396 consultation documents were delivered to all the premises within the consultation area that was agreed with local Ward Councillors during the last consultation process. Notification of the proposals along with an online questionnaire (e-form) was also posted on the Council’s website. In addition, an exhibition was held at Raynes Park Library on 26th, 27th and 28th November 2009.

3.4 To maintain consistency, a decision was taken to combine the cycle route consultation exercise with the Raynes Park Public Realm initiatives that is seeking to establish a consensus on draft streetscape designs for the town centre. The exhibition for this initiative was held jointly with the exhibition for the cycle proposals.

3.5 125 responses were received representing a response rate of 8% (106 from the main consultation area). Of the 125 responses received, 50% were in favour of the proposed cycle facilities and 42% were against with 8% undecided. Of those who supported the scheme there was recognition of the value the scheme for cycle safety and convenience in accessing the south side of the railway through the skew arch and the contribution it would make to the potential future improved pedestrian and cycle link to Wimbledon.

3.6 In response to question 2 within the questionnaire, there were 61% in support of the proposed Toucan crossing north of Raynes Park Bridge with, 27% against and 12% undecided.

3.7 The following table summarises the results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation</th>
<th>Q1. Are you in favour of the proposed cycle facilities?</th>
<th>Q2. Are you in favour of the dedicated crossing facility (north of Raynes Park Bridge)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes  No  Undecided</td>
<td>Yes  No  Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires from inside consultation area</td>
<td>No.  53  38  15</td>
<td>63  29  14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 50% 36% 14%</td>
<td>60% 27% 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires from outside consultation area</td>
<td>No.  6  5  0</td>
<td>8  2  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires at exhibition</td>
<td>No.  4  2  1</td>
<td>4  2  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other letters received (Without Q’aire)</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL - April 2008 consultation</strong></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8 The table above summarises all the consultation responses received including the results of other responses received at the exhibition and through the ‘e-form’ process which reflects the results of the larger consultation area exercise. The table also sets out the results of the previous consultation and both sets of consultation are similar. The only significant difference is that during this consultation 36% objected to the cycle facilities compared to 42% under the previous consultation. All comments received during the consultation have been summarised in Appendix 3.

3.9 Prior to the consultation, the proposals were put to the Ward Councillors for their comments. There has been general support from the Ward Councillors given that the scheme revisions overcomes one of the principle concerns of the original scheme which was the loss of the trees on the railway embankment.

3.10 The emergency services were consulted and no objection was raised to the scheme and the benefit of linking the traffic signals to minimise delay was recognised.

3.11 Merton Cycling Campaign has been consulted and fully support this proposal as do Transport for London who are funding the scheme.

3.12 A copy of the response to the consultation exercise from the Raynes Park Association (which represents local residents groups) is set out in Appendix 4.

4 RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 It is recommended that the Cabinet Member considers the result of the informal consultation along with officer’s comments and agrees:

a) To the undertaking of a formal consultation for the introduction of a new Toucan crossing on the north side of Raynes Park Bridge at its junction with Coombe Lane for either of the two options set out in this report;

b) An un-segregated cycle route between No. 9 Station Buildings eastwards to link to the existing facilities at the Skew Arch and also to Wyke Road;
c) A dismount section requiring cyclist to dismount from the end of the existing cycle track just west of the existing Toucan crossing outside the station to the proposed new facility outside No. 9 Station Buildings;

d) Agrees that the Director of Environment and Regeneration is given delegated authority to consider any comments received in relation to the statutory notice for the Toucan crossing proposal (Option 1 or 2) and decides the appropriate action.

5 TIMETABLE

5.1. If approved, the advertisement of the draft Notice of the Council’s intentions to introduce a new Toucan Crossing on the north side of Raynes Park Bridge, will be published mid January 2010. This involves the erection of the notices on lamp columns in the vicinity of the proposed measures. The documents will also be available at the Link, Civic Centre.

5.2. Additionally, a newsletter will be distributed to all the premises originally consulted as part of these proposals, informing them of the outcome of the Cabinet Member’s decision. Information will also be available on the Council’s website.

5.3. Should any substantive comments be received, as part of the statutory Notice process, affecting safety or operational functionality, such comments will be considered by Officers and the decision to proceed will be delegated to the Director of Environment and Regeneration.

6 FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

6.1. The cost of implementing the proposed footway widening (necessary to accommodate cycle use) and the proposed (OPTION 1) or converted (OPTION 2) Toucan crossing and traffic signal linkages is £150,000. This includes the publication of the required Notice to introduce the Toucan crossing.

6.2. The cost of the proposed cycle scheme can be met from Transport for London's Local Implementation Plan Grant (Capital allocation) for 2009/10.

7 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

7.1. The proposed Toucan Crossing can be introduced under powers conferred by Section 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended). The Council is required by the Local Authorities Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 to give notice to the public of its intention to introduce, alter or remove a formal crossing facility by Notice. This process only requires the Council to consult with the Police. In terms of
the general public, whilst the Notice is not a statutory consultation process as, for example, is the case for measures such as waiting restrictions (introduced under Section 6 or 9 of the same Act), any comments received will be considered.

7.2. A shared use footway can be introduced under Section 65 of the Highways Act 1980 and as defined under Section 329 of the same Act. No specific notices or Orders are required but approval of the relevant Council authority (Cabinet Member for Planning and Traffic Management in Merton’s case) is required (see Recommendation 3).

8 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS.

9.1 The implementation of the subsequent changes to the original design affects all sections of the community especially the young and the elderly and assists in improving safety for all road users and achieves the transport planning policies of the government, the mayor for London and the borough.

9.2 The council carries out careful consultation to ensure that all road users are given a fair opportunity to air their views and express their needs.

9 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

9.1. Cycling on the footway is not permitted unless this is specifically permitted with signs indicating either segregated or unsegregated shared use footway. Such signing currently is in place between the end of the Coombe Lane cycle track and the Cattle Arch. Cyclists are not, however, permitted to travel eastwards towards the Raynes Park Bridge. The area of footway where cycling is permitted is therefore not well defined and any enforcement by the police is made more difficult.

9.2. Between the morning and evening peak periods footway cycling creates no significant problems. However, the Council has received complaints from local people that during busier times, cycle use creates problems and pedestrians feel intimidated and in some cases cyclists become confrontational when challenged.

9.3. It is therefore proposed that, in the interest of safety and providing clarity where cyclists can and cannot use the footway, the area marked blue on the displayed plan outside the station is clearly indicated as a dismount section.

10 RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

10.1. The risk of not introducing the proposed arrangements is that the existing cycle use will continue in an uncontrolled manner on a footway of inadequate width which could lead to increased conflict between pedestrians and cyclists in Coombe Lane.

10.2. The Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 1994 apply to this scheme. Therefore when undertaking its duties as Client and Designer
under these regulations, the Council follows the Approved Code of Practice, ‘Managing Health and Safety in Construction’, published by the Health and Safety Commission. The CMD Coordinator appointed for this scheme is F.M.Conway Ltd.

10.3. As part of this process the road safety implications/risks during construction and maintenance will be fully considered during the detailed stage of the design process.

10.4. The risk in not addressing the issues regarding the poor sightlines for pedestrians crossing the north side of Raynes Park Bridge would lead to increased potential risk of personal injury particularly if the level of pedestrian and cycle flow increases over forthcoming years as expected.

10.5. A safety audit has been requested from TfL but this was not prepared in time for inclusion to this report.

10.6. Health and Safety Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Measures to Reduce Risk</th>
<th>Information on Residual Risk Passed To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Volume of traffic during peak periods          | The appropriate traffic management would be put in place to ensure access and maintain through traffic during construction. This situation exist with the current layout – wider risk given new Toucan crossing. Awaiting safety audit response – potential use of Bell bollards to protect peds. The scheme has been designed to improve visibility so the overall risk could be neutral | • Highways Project Officers undertaking detailed design  
• Planning Supervisor  
• Traffic Project Officers undertaking detailed design – also will be discussed with TfL Safety team  
• Traffic Project Officers undertaking detailed design – also will be discussed with TfL Safety team |

11 APPENDICES

The following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report

• Appendix 1 – Plan of (Option 1) proposals – Drwg No. Z71-135-09
• Appendix 2 – ”We Need Your Views" document and Questionnaire
• Appendix 3 – Consultation Summary
• Appendix 4 – Raynes Park Association Consultation response
The following documents have been relied on in drawing up this report but do not form part of the report:

a) 29th March 2006 Street Management Cabinet Committee Report
b) LCN+ Link 149 CRISP Report (Mayer Brown) - June 2005
c) 17th June 2008 SMAC report
d) Traffic Liaison meeting notes – 9th November 2009

Useful links

Merton Council’s web site: http://www.merton.gov.uk

Readers should note the terms of the legal information (disclaimer) regarding information on Merton Council’s and third party linked websites.

http://www.merton.gov.uk/legal.htm

This disclaimer also applies to any links provided here.
IMPROVEMENTS SINCE THE PREVIOUS SCHEME (April 2008)

- The scheme cost will be around a quarter of the previous scheme;

- The revised scheme proposal has two key components:
  - an improved traffic signal junction north of the Raynes Park Bridge incorporating a pedestrian and cycle
    traffic signals at the Approach Road / Raynes Park Bridge junction. Please see attached drawing for details.
  - an alternative design which provides best value and has no impact on the mature trees on the railway embankment. The scheme has now been revised and your opinions are now being sought.

- The proposed scheme will provide both pedestrians and cyclists an improved east west route linking Coombe Lane
  and Kingston Road at the southern end of the Skew Arch thus avoiding the narrow Cattle Arch and the existing
  dismount section proposed outside the station as this area is considered too busy to permit cycling particularly
  at times of peak train use by commuters;

- The development of a new dedicated Toucan crossing facility which allows pedestrians and cyclists to cross,
  this will be provided just north of the Raynes Park Bridge and will be linked to the existing traffic signals either side
  of the bridge.

- Three pay and display parking bays will be retained for off-peak use.

- The proposal will enable cyclists to join a new cycle track outside the shops and travel eastwards via the Skew
  Arch to the east. This proposal would not involve the loss of any trees. There is a
  kerb line as shown on the attached plan. The proposal would not involve the loss of any trees. There is a
  kerb line as shown on the attached plan.

- An improved traffic signalled junction north of the Raynes Park Bridge incorporating a pedestrian and cycle
  traffic signals at the Approach Road / Raynes Park Bridge junction. Please see attached drawing for details.

- The proposed scheme will provide both pedestrians and cyclists an improved east west route linking Coombe Lane
  and Kingston Road at the southern end of the Skew Arch thus avoiding the narrow Cattle Arch and the existing
  dismount section proposed outside the station as this area is considered too busy to permit cycling particularly
  at times of peak train use by commuters;

- The development of a new dedicated Toucan crossing facility which allows pedestrians and cyclists to cross,
  this will be provided just north of the Raynes Park Bridge and will be linked to the existing traffic signals either side
  of the bridge.

- Three pay and display parking bays will be retained for off-peak use.

- The proposal will enable cyclists to join a new cycle track outside the shops and travel eastwards via the Skew
  Arch to the east. This proposal would not involve the loss of any trees. There is a
  kerb line as shown on the attached plan. The proposal would not involve the loss of any trees. There is a
  kerb line as shown on the attached plan.

- An improved traffic signalled junction north of the Raynes Park Bridge incorporating a pedestrian and cycle
  traffic signals at the Approach Road / Raynes Park Bridge junction. Please see attached drawing for details.

- The proposed scheme will provide both pedestrians and cyclists an improved east west route linking Coombe Lane
  and Kingston Road at the southern end of the Skew Arch thus avoiding the narrow Cattle Arch and the existing
  dismount section proposed outside the station as this area is considered too busy to permit cycling particularly
  at times of peak train use by commuters;

- The development of a new dedicated Toucan crossing facility which allows pedestrians and cyclists to cross,
  this will be provided just north of the Raynes Park Bridge and will be linked to the existing traffic signals either side
  of the bridge.

- Three pay and display parking bays will be retained for off-peak use.

- The proposal will enable cyclists to join a new cycle track outside the shops and travel eastwards via the Skew
  Arch to the east. This proposal would not involve the loss of any trees. There is a
  kerb line as shown on the attached plan. The proposal would not involve the loss of any trees. There is a
  kerb line as shown on the attached plan.

- An improved traffic signalled junction north of the Raynes Park Bridge incorporating a pedestrian and cycle
  traffic signals at the Approach Road / Raynes Park Bridge junction. Please see attached drawing for details.

- The proposed scheme will provide both pedestrians and cyclists an improved east west route linking Coombe Lane
  and Kingston Road at the southern end of the Skew Arch thus avoiding the narrow Cattle Arch and the existing
  dismount section proposed outside the station as this area is considered too busy to permit cycling particularly
  at times of peak train use by commuters;

- The development of a new dedicated Toucan crossing facility which allows pedestrians and cyclists to cross,
  this will be provided just north of the Raynes Park Bridge and will be linked to the existing traffic signals either side
  of the bridge.
Public Consultation

Proposed Cycle Facilities - Coombe lane, Raynes Park

We would like to know your views on the proposed cycle facilities in Coombe Lane. Please tick the appropriate boxes and return this card by Friday 4th December 2009.

Please write in BLOCK capitals

Name: ................................................................. Signature: .............................................................
Road: ................................................................. Property No./Name: .............................................
Email: ................................................................. Post Code: ..........................................................

Please tick if you would like the above information to be confidential. ☐

1. Are you a resident or business? ☐ Resident ☐ Business ☐ Both
2. Are you in favour of the proposed cycle facilities? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Undecided
3. Are you in favour of the dedicated crossing facility? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Undecided

Do you have any additional comments regarding the proposals? (Please write in BLOCK capitals)
.......................................................................................................................................................
.......................................................................................................................................................
.......................................................................................................................................................
.......................................................................................................................................................
.......................................................................................................................................................
.......................................................................................................................................................
.......................................................................................................................................................
.......................................................................................................................................................
.......................................................................................................................................................

Please Note: In view of the large number of responses received during a public consultation it will not be possible to reply individually to each respondent.

It will be appreciated if you would complete the monitoring information requested below.

---

**EQUAL OPPORTUNITY MONITORING INFORMATION**

Please help us to improve our services by telling us about yourself. This information will be treated in strict confidence and will only be used to produce anonymous statistics for equal opportunities monitoring purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>☐ Male</th>
<th>☐ Female</th>
<th>Do you consider yourself to have a disability?</th>
<th>☐ Yes</th>
<th>☐ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**AGE GROUP** (please tick one box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>15 or under</th>
<th>20 - 24</th>
<th>30 - 34</th>
<th>40 - 44</th>
<th>50 - 54</th>
<th>60 - 64</th>
<th>70 - 74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 - 19</td>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>45 - 49</td>
<td>55 - 59</td>
<td>65 - 69</td>
<td>75 or over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ETHNIC ORIGIN** (please tick one box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>Mixed Ethnicity</th>
<th>Black or Black British</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ White - English</td>
<td>☐ White &amp; Black Caribbean</td>
<td>☐ Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ White - Scottish</td>
<td>☐ White &amp; Black African</td>
<td>☐ African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ White - Welsh</td>
<td>☐ White &amp; Asian</td>
<td>☐ Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ White - Irish</td>
<td>☐ Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Gypsy / Roma / Traveller</td>
<td>☐ Asian or Asian British</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other (please specify)</td>
<td>☐ Indian</td>
<td>☐ Heterosexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Chinese &amp; Other Ethnic Groups</td>
<td>☐ Pakistani</td>
<td>☐ Lesbian or Gay man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Chinese</td>
<td>☐ Bangladeshi</td>
<td>☐ Bisexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Korean</td>
<td>☐ Tamil</td>
<td>☐ Transsexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other (please specify)</td>
<td>☐ Other (please specify)</td>
<td>☐ Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FAITH/BELIEF** (please tick one box)

What is your faith/belief?

| ☐ Buddhist | ☐ Christian | ☐ Hindu |
| ☐ Muslim | ☐ Jewish | ☐ Sikh |
| ☐ Other (please specify) | |

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROAD</th>
<th>CONSULTED</th>
<th>NUMBER OF RETURNS</th>
<th>% OF RESPONSE</th>
<th>RESIDENT BUSINESS</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>NUMBER CONSULTED</th>
<th>NUMBER OF RETURNS</th>
<th>% OF RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amity Grove</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Road</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astor Road</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Park Avenue</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Lane</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coombe Lane</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coombe Road</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer's Park Road</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog's Drive</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friston Avenue</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington Road</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington Avenue</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langham Road</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambton Road</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambton Road</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langham Road</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langham Road</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langham Road</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESULTS BY ROAD FOR COOMBE LANE CYCLE FACILITIES - NOV/DEC 2009

APPENDIX 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Unsure %</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wyke Road</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worple Road</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trewhine Road</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolvene Road</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roskine Road</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Georges Avenue</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendarves Road</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langleham Road</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambton Road</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenwyn Road</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Drive</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore Road</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firstway</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devas Road</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Park Avenue</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston Road</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Road</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amity Grove</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amity Grove</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632914</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3 Are you in favour of the dedicated crossing facility?
RAYNES PARK ASSOCIATION

NOTES FROM MEETING ON 28TH NOVEMBER 2009 RE PROPOSED CYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FOOTPATH IN RAYNES PARK

Chaired by Chris Larkman - Chair of RPA

Attended by 29 residents of Raynes Park

Introduction: Chris gave a brief outline of the previous proposals and the present proposal. It was noted that the main purpose of the meeting was to look at the proposed cycle track.

Positives:
- Present cycle track crossing the traffic tunnel south of the railway line is very dangerous - this scheme avoids that crossing point
- For those residents south of the railway line, this will improve things considerably both for pedestrians and cyclists to be able to cross the road safely from skew arch towards the station
- paving etc around the skew arch will look so much better
- having extra traffic lights at that point is a positive and negative - but the present lights at the skew arch are not safe, as pedestrians do not use them the way they are laid out

Negatives:
- expensive and destructive whilst the work is being done
- does not appear that an audit of how much use the present cycle track has
- will encourage cyclists rather than provide for those already in existence
- should not be a ‘shared space’ - mixing pedestrians and cyclists - even though legally pedestrians have priority over a shared space
- should we be encouraging cyclists, when the roads are already so dangerous?
- another set of traffic lights is one too many
- concern about how the bus shelter will be positioned, and whether there will be sufficient vision-line to enable people to see when the bus is coming
- the main line of travel for cyclists will be east-west, and pedestrians north-south - at the bellmouth - so crossing each other
- present cycle track is a waste of money, underused - why do more?

General Discussion:
- What will the effective of Waitrose be on the traffic flows - and how is that being incorporated into the TfL planning?
- A straw poll of those present was taken on who were cyclists - three fifths - and most of them use the Coombe Lane cycle track. Of the cyclists one third were in favour of the present proposal.
- We should be encouraging cycling and cyclists - and making provision for them, both now and for the future
- The question to be asked is which is less desirable - cyclists as now cycling through the cattle arch, or across the forecourt?
• The stretch across the forecourt should be marked in some way as a cycle track to draw attention to it
• We have the problem of not enough space to satisfy everyone
• We need more of a change of culture - including cyclists and cycling more - we need to encourage more people to cycle
• Experienced cyclists will always use the road, rather than cycle paths
• Many cyclists are going to be children - they need to be taken into account
• Enforcement of laws (i.e. cyclists on footpaths) needs to take place more often
• Possibility of introducing 20mph speed limit across centre of Raynes Park - will have effect of slowing down ALL traffic
• There are plans to improve the road south of the traffic arch - which will make things easier for cyclists there

A vote was taken:

1. Cyclists have to go somewhere - this is the best option so let’s go for it
2. Status Quo

1 = 14 votes
2 = 13 votes

Next Stages:

The Raynes Park Community Forum at 7.15 on 16th December will offer residents the opportunity to discuss this further with LBM Councillors and Officers

LBM SMAC meeting at 7.15 on 12th January (public meeting) will make recommendations to Cabinet Member in charge of street management - Cllr William Brierly - who will make the final decision a few days later

The contract needs to be put in place by the end of the financial year.

Special Note:

The Meeting concentrated on the Cycle Track Proposals, and there was not the opportunity to address the Enhancement Plan Proposals i.e. the area between the proposed Waitrose site and Wyke Road on the north of the railway. The Enhancement Plan proposals contain various alternatives for which further consultation will be required.