

Minutes of meeting between Camden Council and CCC

Wednesday 22nd May 2003 at 4.30 pm

Present: Dave Stewart (LBC), Ed Quartey (LBC), Paul Gasson (CCC), and Jean Dollimore (CCC).

1. Design/construction phase issues

a. Seven Stations Link east from Gordon Square

- *SSL 'kink' at Bedford Way junction. The new segregated cycle track being constructed in Tavistock Place has an unnecessarily sharp bend on the track which is going to make it highly dangerous for 2 way use.*

Ed explained that the extra space inside the triangle is for vehicles in the left lane to use, when those in the right lane are waiting to turn right. The track has already been modified and photographs of its current state were presented. Paul stated that although the modification is an improvement, cyclists need more space to negotiate curves and there may still be collisions. Ed explained that the cycle track follows the existing kerb, which has been cut back a little and the track is 2.5 metres wide on the curve. We discussed cutting the kerb back at the corner but there is a lamp post and a BT junction box close to the edge – it would be costly to drop the latter. Dave promised to investigate the possibility of lowering the BT box. He will also think about introducing a very gradual table for the length of the curve.

- *The consultation document on SSL east of Judd Street states that the new cycle track will be 2 metres wide. (see April minutes which states 2.5 metres)*

Dave confirmed that the track is definitely 2.5 metres wide in the design.

- *The consultation document also states that cyclists will cross the junction with Judd Street on the pedestrian phase, which will be rather difficult for pedestrians. (see April minutes which mention a toucan crossing)*

Dave explained to us that the design does specify that pedestrians and cyclists should cross on the same phase (14 secs out of 96 secs – cars require 3 phases as those coming from east and west on Tavistock Place must have separate phases). CCC expressed grave doubts as to the safety of pedestrians in this design for two reasons. (The pedestrian crossing is set back about 3 m. from the corner) : i) Cyclists approaching the signal at the junction, but not yet over the pedestrian crossing may see their green light at the same time as the pedestrians see their 'walk' sign, with a risk that cyclists and pedestrians may collide, in spite of a give way line on the track. ii) Cyclists waiting at the red light may become congested and back up over the pedestrian crossing, then need to rush over the pedestrian crossing when the lights change. Ed gave us cyclist timings of 3 secs from the pedestrian crossing to the junction and 7-8 secs to cross the junction.

Dave promised to reconsider the design of the crossing and to send CCC information as to signal phases. One possibility is to put the cyclists' stop line back at the pedestrian crossing, to allow both eastern and western traffic on Tavistock Place to go on the same phase, and to allow cyclists a phase of 20 secs with pedestrians crossing in a separate phase.

Paul said he thinks the ramps on the Royal College Street track (at the bus stops) are too steep and is concerned that we had gentler ramps on the approach to Judd St junction; Dave S said that they will not exceed 1:15.

The meeting discussed the letter from Tim Robinson in response to the consultation. (He claimed to represent Judd Street residents association, but gave a personal cyclist's view on the scheme). CCC wishes to be disassociated from his comments. His objections are: i) 2-way cycle lanes are dangerous (although some of his points are valid, we think the 2-way cycle lane option is the best). ii) the crossing of Judd street where the cycle lane changes from the north to the south side may confuse drivers (we disagreed). iii) the sharing of a phase by pedestrians and cyclists is dangerous (CCC agrees).

- *SSL consultation. Frank Dobson is still opposed to the Regent Square-Sidmouth Street route because he thinks it will cause an increase in traffic in Guildford Street. What are the projected figures for such an increase, if any?*

Frank Dobson probably does not know that there will be 2-way motor traffic in Regents Square/Sidmouth Street. The Camden engineers do not expect any displacement of traffic. Jean will write back to Frank Dobson (or Paul will do so if Jean tells him she didn't manage).

b. Pancras Road

- *The new track between St. Pancras and Kings Cross stations. It is not marked as a cycle track, it has lamp posts and a BT box in the middle and does not link up with other routes.*

Dave is not up to date with this work, which is managed by Laurie Baker's team. Paul stated that the current track is shared with pedestrians; he asked Dave to take care of it and will pass on correspondence about it. Dave promised to try to find out what is going on.

c. Agar Grove/St Pancras Way progress

- *Progress update*

Ed said that they are doing the footway works and crossings, but there is no date from TTS for signals. Camden

will put pressure on TTS. Once the signals are in, the rest will be completed.

Paul queried the slightly rippled surface of the track in Royal College Street, and asked if we'd be getting the same for the Pancras Way track. Dave said yes as this was due to the surface having to be hand laid as there was no surface laying machinery which could operate in less than 3 metre widths.

- *Design changes for Royal College St/Georgiana St junction*

Paul will get back to Dave as soon as possible with suggestions as to the layout. Dave urged CCC to do this as soon as possible as he needs to ask for additional funding.

d. Bury Place design

- *with reference to the drawing sent to Paul by Edward Quartey*

Dave told us that this is part of LCN route 6 will be accessible from the SSL at Malet Street, then proceed via Montague Place, Montague Street and across Great Russell Street into Bury Place. Dave said that the Bloomsbury Clear Zones development has proposed that no motor vehicles should be allowed to turn into Malet Street from Torrington Place or Byng Place, but there would be a plug for cyclists. Northbound cars in Malet Street turn west at this junction. There would be no need to segregate cyclists in Malet Street.

Bury Place is a 1-way street with motor traffic flowing south. The Bury Place scheme proposes a segregated 1-way contraflow 1.2 metre cycle lane on the west side. Southbound cyclists would proceed with the other traffic. Paul warned of the dangers where the cycle lane passes junctions and asked for information on peak flows and traffic speeds. In response to a question from Paul, Ed pointed out that without segregation, cars will park in the cycle lane. Paul stated that CCC want a 1.5 m track and Ed will look into it.

We discussed the potential clash between cyclists and pedestrians at the pedestrian crossing on Great Russell Street. This crossing is heavily used. How can we avoid this problem?

Paul will take the plans to the next CCC meeting (June 9th) and ask whether 1.2 (or 1.5) metres will be acceptable and seek a discussion of the pedestrian crossing at the north end.

e. Eton Avenue market

- *Progress update*

Dave stated that there has been no progress. Ben(Ben who?) has had no response from the designers. In response from a query from Paul, Dave assured CCC that they cannot freeze the design until Camden has agreed it.

f. Extra item. Sidmouth Street/Ampton Road crossing

Paul is concerned by the traffic light phases which have reverted to their former dangerous settings (60 secs with 7 secs for cyclists to cross to Sidmouth – this phase is shared with cars coming from Sidmouth Street that can turn right across the cyclists coming from Ampton Street). Paul has had many complaints from Islington cyclists. Paul wants to know the signal phasing for the new route. Dave replied that the signal phasing had been improved to allow cyclists a 5 sec dedicated phase, but that TTS had reverted to the bad scheme without consulting him.

Paul will write to Ian Henderson at TTS. (Ian.Henderson@streetmanagement.org.uk). TTS have said they will 'do it' this financial year, but Paul will remind TTS of their commitment and ask them what they will do and when.

2. Generic design solutions required

This agenda item had been left from the previous meeting, but thanks to good progress we were able to start a discussion on 'generic design solutions'.

Paul introduced the idea of establishing some criteria based on design experience, which Camden could use to help others and CCC could use when considering new schemes.

Dave said he is looking into policy on the layout of islands, but that any design should take local considerations into account.

Paul suggested that there should be guidelines for painted cycle markings e.g. to avoid dangers from car doors.

Dave asked where CCC's suggested guidelines (e.g. track across unsignalled junction, track in narrow carriageway at junction) had come from.

Paul replied that they had come from designs done by Dave and others in Camden council.

Dave said he would need to think hard about the suggested guidelines and that he will look into developing and expanding them. He prefers to see the guidelines as the narrowing down of options rather than as generic solutions.

3. Policy and process issues

This agenda item was deferred due to lack of time.