

DS.100 Reducing the width of existing footways

Ver.	Status	Created by	Date	Approved by	Date
Rev A	Final	D.Farnham/C.Mascord	12.03.12	D.Waters	10.04.12
Rev B	Final	G Lake	14.06.18	D Foden	19.06.19



1 Introduction

1.1 Notes

- a. This standard explains requirements about narrowing existing footways and other routes or spaces for pedestrians only.

1.2 Discussion

- a. Footways and footpaths provide space in which pedestrians can move and socialise without concern about potential conflict with vehicles.
- b. On older streets, the width of these features is often less than ideal. Many will have been reduced over the years to provide space for increasing vehicle traffic and other functions that have come into existence since the street was first planned. Even in more recently created streets they will often have been designed to inadequate widths.
- c. Southwark's Kerbside Strategy outlines out how the estimated increase in population, local economy and change in consumer behaviour will increase the number of trips, services and deliveries in Southwark. This will inevitably place more pressure on our road network, leading to more congestion, slower bus times and air pollution. We must encourage more people to walk or cycle if we are to meet our duties to keep traffic moving and improve the health of our resident. Wide footways are essential in facilitating walking as a preferred travel choice.

2 Requirements

- a. No existing footway, footpath or verge (or other area for pedestrians only) should be narrowed to provide access or waiting including (but not limited to) the following:
 - i. Motor vehicle parking.
 - ii. The creation of new carriageways or widening of those existing.
 - iii. Docking points for the London Cycle Hire Scheme, but not other types of pedal cycle parking.

NOTE 1: Cycle tracks are excluded from this clause. These are addressed separately by standard DS.203.

NOTE 2: Loading bays may be provided to accommodate the anticipated increase in deliveries as e-commerce changes consumer behaviour, car ownership in Southwark decreases and the population density increases. However, the loading bay must be 'managed', either by a short duration maximum stay restriction, or by a booking system to allocate time slots.

NOTE 3: Green infrastructure (planters, rain gardens, trees, etc.) may be considered within footways to help address climate change, water run-off and urban heat island impact.

- b. Any exception from 'a' will require agreement of a level 2 departure. As part of the submission it will need to be demonstrated that:
 - i. The proposals would be part of broader reconfiguration of the street and would permit the provision of substantial additional pedestrian only space elsewhere or avoid the need for the potential otherwise unavoidable 'shared' vehicle use of those areas (see note).
 - ii. Minimum pedestrian passing width values, generally 2.4m will still be met or exceeded.

NOTE 1: A potential instance of the latter point could be where it is proposed to introduce contra-flow facilities for cyclists but it is not possible to accommodate these within the carriageway because of limited width. Narrowing of a footway to allow the introduction of a cycle lane in a widened carriageway would likely be preferable to the possible introduction of a footway cycle track providing minimum passing widths for pedestrians were still well met.

NOTE 2: A departure is not required where the proposal is to reduce the width of a previous buildout that was not provided to facilitate pedestrian flow.

- c. Any departure from 'a' should first be provided In Principal Only. Final Confirmation should be subject to consultation with members of the public and other relevant stakeholders on this specific issue, and the Highway Authority being satisfied that the proposal is broadly supported. This consultation may take place as part of a wider consultation on design proposals providing this issue is highlighted within the consultation information.
- d. In considering any departure, Southwark's Street Wise Approach should be followed when prioritising the allocation and balancing competing demands on the kerbside (see table 1 below).

Priority	Intervention	Why?
1	Highway safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healthy streets • Air quality objectives particularly around schools • Impacts on all kerbside users • Statutory obligation • Reduce pedestrian and cyclist casualties • Vision zero objective
2	Pedestrian improvements for all ages and abilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All users are ultimately pedestrians • Social equity reasons • Consistent with adopted movement hierarchy • Most efficient use of space • Economic benefits
3	Cycle improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycling for all ages and abilities • 10% by 2025 target • Contributes to many public health objectives • Economic benefits
4	Public transport and shared mobility options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Typically bus stop/rail stations – high footfall environment • Efficiency, environmental and social equity reasons • Journey time improvements • Ease of accessibility
5	Delivery and servicing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support local economic activity • Minimise conflict with other road users • Green last mile trips
6	Street trees/green infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change adaption • Reducing surface water run-off • Reduce urban heat island impact
7	<p>Parking allocation priority on residential streets</p> <p>Parking allocation priority in town centres</p>	<p>Discourage commuter parking and prioritise, where required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disabled parking • Residential cycle parking including adaptive bikes • Car sharing vehicles • Resident vehicle parking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disabled parking • Prioritise short stay spaces for shoppers

Table 1. Southwark Street Wise Approach.