

Meeting to discuss QW Jubilee, 30 July 2014

Present

Sustrans: Jimmy Hall

Camden: Kevin de Leeuw, Darren Barton, Jonathan Russell

CCC: George Coulouris, Jean Dollimore (Notes)

Introduction (mostly JH, also KdL)

- Andrew Gilligan has commissioned the Walthamstow-Bloomsbury (QW 38) to be delivered by 2016
- other QWs for first phase include the Jubilee QW
- next phase may possibly include QW 46 (extends RCS northern extension via Grafton Rd to Savernake Road), QW31 (the Primrose Hill route from Boundary Road to Delancey-Pratt), QW 29 (parallel to Camden Road from RCS to York Way); still to be decided
- funding £130million for 10years on 30-40 routes, approximately £2-3 million per project
- Sustrans standards - for unaccompanied 12 year old

Linking to the route network in Camden

CCC:

- QW Jubilee stops at Boundary Road and then continues on a Grid route into Westminster.
- it is important to make the connection (e.g. by signage) into the Primrose Hill Route and then to the Camden Grid link on Delancey–Pratt (see <http://goo.gl/maps/gZvxJ>)

Alignment

JH: Broadhurst and Compayne Gardens are alternative alignments

CCC:

1. we prefer Compayne Gardens as the buses on Broadhurst Gardens should be avoided
2. we very much welcome two-way cycling on Broadhurst Gardens between Priory Road and West End lane to complete a NB route on Priory Road
3. Our preferred option is to combine (2) with an alignment on Compayne Gardens; otherwise the route should use Broadhurst Gardens between Priory Road and West End Lane

General issues

CCC:

- Sinusoidal humps must be constructed to a high standard and truly sinusoidal
- Traffic Counts: CCC would expect to see data on cycle and motor flows for the roads on this alignment (e.g. Sustrans state that to share the road motor flows should be less than 3000PCUs pre day and LCC demand 2000PCUs as the limit.
- Casualty/Collision figures: JH promised to let us have these by email.

Details

Loudoun Road outside South Hampstead Station:

CCC continues to be concerned by the proposal to widen the pavements and force cyclists to 'take the lane' in a 2 x 3m carriageway. If we understood you correctly, you have been asked to narrow the carriageway to protect the bridge. In that case I think a short section of segregated cycle track should be considered here.

Belsize Roundabout:

During the meeting we studied options that retain the roundabout, simply adding a protected route between Loudoun Road and Fairhazel Gardens in one or both directions.

CCC are concerned about the number of stops involved in the protected route and for users of the roundabout on other alignments.

Dutch Style Roundabout: JH stated that Sustrans have studied this possibility but that the maximum size roundabout at this location will not allow buses to get through. (Drawing QW-02-C-01-01 supplied by email to CCC 3.07.14)

Signalised Cross Roads: will require removal of the Willow tree in the middle. But it could be claimed that when it's not trimmed it obscures the view anyway. CCC asked for a design for a cross roads (with Fairhazel Gardens T-d to Belsize Road SW of roundabout); and with no exit from the NW part of Belsize Road.

JH supplied by email two alternative drawings for a cross roads solution (JQW-02-C-05-01 and JQW-02-C-06-01 which incorporates a protected route for cyclists between Loudoun Road and Fairhazel Gardens). These are very interesting and seem the best solution to us. We prefer the design with the protected route which should be attractive to all cyclists.

Two-way cycling in the one-way side streets near Fairhazel Gardens

The design proposal includes contraflow cycling on all one-way streets in the neighbourhood to improve access to the QW route.

CCC acknowledged that there is an argument for consistency throughout the area so that drivers get used to two way cycling in one way streets. But they are wary of implementing it on every street without a study of local conditions; in particular they would advise against it on the roads that are bus routes (Canfield-Cleve and Broadhurst Gardens). In 2012 we decided against the eastern section of Goldhurst Terrace as it is too steep; no others remain.

Standards for two-way cycling in one way streets

Camden's 2012 implementation in this area shows the general principles that need to be considered in the area for a 'lightweight contraflow' implementation (no marked lanes) :

- entry treatments and exit treatments (e.g. Priory Road gets it right):

<http://www.camdencyclists.org.uk/newsitems/ccc/west-hampstead-contraflows>

this post also points out some issues that were later corrected e.g. leaving old 'one way arrows' or 'NO ENTRY' across the whole road width.

- Road hump markings: the photo of Messina Avenue shows what's wrong.

Fairhazel Gardens

this already has two-way cycling right through – the section south of Canfield Gardens was implemented around 20 years ago as a mandatory contraflow lane outside parked cars with a small separation buffer (contraflow cyclists face the parked cars). Entry and exit treatments with separator islands which were needed at that time.

should we retain the mandatory contraflow lane? GC after an inspection: I think removal of the existing mandatory cycle track would be a disbenefit to cyclists. The road is narrow and the solid-lined cycle lane makes it very clear to motorists that the contraflow has equal priority. A few logos and arrows would encourage more aggressive behaviour. I was able to witness the advantage of the fully-marked track when a mother carrying a small child cycled along the track looking very confident as oncoming cars slowed for her. I don't think the proximity to the parked cars is a major issue because (a) cyclists are used to keeping to the offside of the cycle lane when passing cars and (b) all the cars are facing oncoming cyclists so car occupants are unlikely to open as a cyclist is passing. So we favour keeping the mandatory contraflow track. I do agree that the strange island-protected entries to the contraflow track could be removed.

the section between Canfield Gardens and Compayne Gardens (implemented in 2012) - please correct Note 1 on JQW-03-C-11-01

Greencroft Gardens already has two-way cycling so no need to permit it
priority over side roads: this should be established at all junctions in particular at Canfield Gardens.

Drawing JQW-06-C-01-02

Please note that Priory Road already has two way cycling right through

Broadhurst Gardens

As above, CCC is against contraflow cycling on a bus route, even with passing places. However, we are keen to have two-way cycling between Priory Road and West End Lane to complete the northbound route on Priory Road.

West End Lane

CCC accepts that there is no better alternative route that can avoid the very congested section between Compayne Gardens and Iverson Road. Also that the total building to building width is insufficient for both adequate cycle lanes and footways.

Section between Compayne Gardens and Sheriff Road:

We discussed two alternatives:

- carriageway 6.2 m shared by cyclists and motors, CCC noted that i) having to take the lane isn't appropriate for a QW and ii) some cyclists will find it frustratingly slow not being able to overtake

- 3m general lanes and 2m median strip (very slightly raised) but cyclists still encouraged to take primary position. May have advantage that some cyclists could use the median strip to overtake.

Section between Broadhurst Gardens and Iverson Road:

JH presented a 'shared space' option without signals at Broadhurst Gardens and Iverson Road; surface patterns to be used to hint at possible usage e.g. 'informal roundabout at the junctions of Broadhurst Gardens and Iverson Road; and crossing points.

Some discussion of schemes In Poynton and Exhibition Road, neither of which seem to work well for cyclists.

CCC would like to have further explanations as to how this might work in practice and if possible a pointer to an existing example that solves problems such as: "if motors stay in the middle of the roadspace, wouldn't cycles become mixed with pedestrians at the side?". We could then discuss at a members meeting.

The suggested alternative is a median strip approach as described above.

Iverson Road and Maygrove Road

Sustrans' drawing shows a right turn pocket from Iverson Road to Maygrove Road.

CCC stated that Maygrove Road should be filtered so as to eliminate through motor traffic but allow access to all addresses on this road. e.g. a filter could be placed between Barlow Road and Fordwych Road.

KdL noted that the road had been closed by building works recently.

JD 31 July 2014