

Response to first draft CRISP report on LCN+ Route 16 / Link 67



London Cycling Campaign in Hackney



Trevor Parsons and Oliver Schick, with advice from Richard Lewis
Version 1.0, 20th October 2006

Table of Contents

Detailed comments on Route 16 / link 67 draft report.....	3
Appendix B – Data Sheets.....	8

Detailed comments on Route 16 / link 67 draft report

Executive Summary	
4 th para	This section of the Executive Summary will need updating. The CRISP brief is no longer in draft.
6 th para	We are hopeful that all of the points contained in our response will be addressed satisfactorily, in line with the statements made in this paragraph.

Introduction	
1.0.4	The LCDS are now published in final form.
1.0.6	The CRISP document specification is no longer in draft.
1.0.7	Owing to the special nature of this CRISP, the initial draft report was produced during a time when the remarks made in this paragraph were correct, but there is now a much updated procedure for the production of CRISP reports.

2.0 Route description	
2.0.1	The eastern section of Link 67 is not the most eastern section of Route 16, as the route continues into Tower Hamlets.
2.0.3	We would prefer the neutral word 'collision' to be substituted for 'accident' throughout the document, in line with best practice by the police and other organisations.
<i>2.1 B144 Eagle Wharf Road</i>	
2.1.1 & 2.1.2	Eagle Wharf Road has since been converted to two-way operation on most of its route, with a short one-way section at the east end with two-way cycling.
2.1.3	Change 'Pool Penn Street' to 'Poole Street'.
2.1.4	The Regent's Canal has a top speed limit of 6mph and has a very limited capacity. It is already very busy with cycle traffic at peak times to the detriment of walkers.
<i>2.2 Section between A1200 New North Road and A10 Kingsland Road</i>	
2.2.1	The description of the area is too sweeping. The section between New North Road and Kingsland Road is actually quite varied. Although this is mainly a residential area of predominantly social housing, the route passes the new Gainsborough Studios residential development, Shoreditch Park, the Britannia Leisure Centre, a shopping area at the north end of Hoxton Street, and the large City & Hackney Primary Health Care Trust site at St Leonard's.
2.2.2	Again, 'Pool Penn Street' is wrong. The street is called Poole Street between New North Road and Bridport Place. From there to the junction with Harvey Street it is called Penn Street, and from Harvey Street to the Whitmore Road / Pitfield Street / Hoxton Street junction it is called Hyde Road. What and where is the "local car park" referred to? Is it the underground car park of Gainsborough Studios?
2.2.3	The junction is here referred to as the 'Pitfield Street Roundabout' and in the next paragraph as the 'Whitmore Road roundabout'. To avoid confusion with the other roundabout junction on Pitfield Street, to the south at its junction with Fanshaw Street and New North Road, could we please standardly refer to this one as 'the Britannia junction' here and henceforth?
2.2.4	LB Hackney has, to our knowledge, withdrawn its plans for a scheme based on the existing roundabout, and this junction should therefore be re-included into this CRISP.
2.2.5	Nuttall Street is mis-spelt here. Please change 'Hoxton Market' to 'Hoxton Street market'. It's a common confusion, but Hoxton Market itself is actually a small square half a mile to

	the south, near Old Street (and was the site of the original market in this area).
<i>2.3 Whiston Road</i>	
2.3.1	The remark about the 'west arm' of the junction (Nuttall Street) really belongs in the previous section.
2.3.2	The available carriageway is not particularly narrow. If we're referring to the predominant width of the carriageway in this part of the report, then it should be noted around 2.2.5 that Nuttall Street is very narrow, with little passing space for cycle traffic when vehicle queues are formed.
<i>2.4 Pritchard's Road</i>	
2.4.2	This junction has now been signalised.
<i>2.5 Andrew's Road</i>	
2.5.1	Indeed, almost the whole length of this link from New North Road to Cambridge Heath Road is unfortunately heavily used by rat-running HGV traffic.
2.5.3	Change 'A107 Heath Road' to 'A107 Cambridge Heath Road / Mare Street'. This junction appears to be where the two street names meet. Correct this and subsequent references from 'Vyners Road' to 'Vyner Street'.

<i>3.0 Methodology</i>	
3.0.6	Please correct 'London Cycle Campaign' to 'London Cycling Campaign'.

<i>5.0 Consultation Issues</i>	
5.4	It should probably be noted in this section that almost all of the route has since the CRIM been included in a 20mph zone with significant traffic calming now in place.
5.9.3	<p>Nuttall Street and Pitfield Street are mis-spelt. Please check all street name spellings.</p> <p>Please clarify what is meant by a "range of different images".</p> <p>The most awkward junction is that of Hoxton Street and Nuttall Street, which is overdimensioned and confusing. The most troublesome movement here is the 'right' turn for southbound cycle traffic continuing on Hoxton Street.</p>
5.9.5	<p>Whiston Road and Middleton Road are a long way from each other. We do not understand why Middleton Road is mentioned here.</p> <p>The two sections of Whiston Road east and west of Queensbridge Road are quite different in character, and it should be made clear that the observations about "single file" or rather alternate two-way working only apply to the eastern section.</p>
5.10.2	This junction has since been signalised.
5.11.1 and 5.11.2	<p>We would be cautious about advocating a central toucan between the staggered junction with on-footway shared use links as is suggested here and elsewhere in the report. This would result in awkward and potentially hazardous cycle movements between carriageway and footway in the junction mouths. In addition, the footways are not wide enough for comfortable shared use, as has been noted in the CRIM report for Link 199, the continuation of Link 16 into Tower Hamlets.</p> <p>There may be a case for installing a pedestrian crossing, which could assist cycle manoeuvres. However, any signalised solution would have the negative result of causing delays to cyclists on the A107, which will probably always carry more cycle traffic than LCN+ Route 16.</p> <p>We would support a study of this junction to devise and test the widest possible range of solutions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Point mode-filter (closure with permeability for cycles) at the junction of Andrews Road. ● Left in / left out restrictions (except cyclists) to reduce rat running but enable essential access. ● Re-profiling of Mare Street north of the canal bridge to improve

	<p>sightlines at Vyner Street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provision of central refuges to facilitate two-stage on-carriageway crossing of cycle traffic in both directions.
5.11.4	<p>Point 2: 'cycle priority measures' seems to imply cycle lanes, which should not be necessary on a traffic-calmed street where queueing is not a predominant problem.</p> <p>Point 3: please include non-signalisation options.</p> <p>Point 4 seems to have acquired a phonetic Cockney rendering of 'Hoxton!' Please change the junction reference to 'the Britannia junction' or 'Hyde Road / Pitfield Street / Hoxton Street / Whitmore Road junction'. Again, we would be cautious about referring to "cycle priority measures", which seems to imply cycle lanes.</p> <p>Point 5: please correct the spelling of Queensbridge Road. Again, we would be cautious about referring to "cycle priority measures", which seems to imply cycle lanes in a context where they would be less than helpful.</p>

6.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

6.0.2	This route has little direct relevance to Hackney Town Centre. We would suggest 'Hoxton Street and Broadway Market town centres'.
-------	---

Appendix B – Data Sheets

Option for logos and repeater signs should be deleted on all subsequent data sheets and dealt with separately (see B1 in our preface).

1.1	This is not LB Hackney. Amend or remove.
1.2	This is not LB Hackney. Amend or remove.
2.1	<p>Is LB Hackney responsible for this junction?</p> <p>We support the use of central refuges as per option 1.</p> <p>However, we suggest that the preferred option should be a full cross-authority study of all solutions for the junctions of Andrews Road and Vyner Street with the A107.</p>
2.2	<p>It would seem essential to include a photo of this junction.</p> <p>We would like to see a non-signalised option added, and would prefer to see that type of solution recommended over signalisation.</p> <p>As stated above, we suggest that the preferred option should be a full cross-authority study of all solutions for the junctions of Andrews Road and Vyner Street with the A107.</p>
3.1	It would be useful to include a photo of this junction.
3.2	<p>It would be useful to include a photo of this junction.</p> <p>The junction with Sheep Lane is over-dimensioned. Please consider adding an option for tightening up the junction radii, which would assist pedestrians on the northern footway and eastbound cyclists.</p>
3.3	No comment.
4.1	Some footway and re-profiling work has been done on this junction since the CRIM. We would question the feasibility of raising this junction. The priority must be to cut out through HGV traffic on this route entirely.
4.2	No comment.
4.3	Junction has since been signalised. This data sheet needs updating to reflect current situation.
5.1	Traffic calming has since been installed. This data sheet needs updating to reflect current situation.
5.2	Traffic calming has since been installed. This data sheet needs updating to reflect current situation.

5.3	Traffic calming has since been installed. This data sheet needs updating to reflect current situation.
6.0	<p>ASLs were installed on Whiston Road but were subsequently removed to due lead-in lanes being of sub-standard width. Given the narrowness of Whiston Road at both approaches to the junction, it is difficult to see how ASLs can lawfully and safely be installed here.</p> <p>However we would like to see them installed on the Queensbridge Road arms, even though this would result in the narrowing of carriageway lanes to one each way. Please include this as an option.</p>
7.1	<p>The junction with Thurtle Road is over-dimensioned. Please include an option to tighten this up as much as possible, which will also assist pedestrians crossing on the southern footway of Whiston Road.</p> <p>Traffic calming has since been installed. This data sheet needs updating to reflect current situation.</p>
7.2	Traffic calming has since been installed. This data sheet needs updating to reflect current situation.
7.3	Traffic calming has since been installed. This data sheet needs updating to reflect current situation.
8.0	An adequate ASL is already installed at the Whiston Road arm. As for the Nuttall Street arm, given the narrowness of the carriageway, it is difficult to see how ASLs can lawfully and safely be installed here.
9.0	<p>Traffic calming has since been installed, including raised junctions. This data sheet needs updating to reflect current situation.</p> <p>The ramps to the raised junctions are very severe. Consider including an option to improve these for comfortable traversal by cycle traffic.</p> <p>Entrance to St Leonard's site is absurdly over-dimensioned. Please include an option to tighten up this junction in consultation with the PCT.</p>
10.0	The junction of Hoxton Street and Nuttall Street is very wide, with a tricky 'right' turn for cycle traffic continuing southbound on Hoxton Street. Please include an option to examine ways of assisting cycle traffic to leave LCN+ Link 67 at this point, which could include footway widening and/or a central refuge.
10.2	No comment.
10.3	No comment.

10.4	No comment. It would be useful to include a photo of this junction.
11.0	<p>We would like to see a recommendation for option 2. The most important stakeholder at this junction are pedestrians, who suffer diversion and severance because of the roundabout. Increasing the size of the roundabout would not improve matters for walking.</p> <p>In 'Other comments' please amend to reflect re-inclusion of this junction in the CRISP.</p> <p>[Where is data sheet 12.0? Please review numbering of data sheets for consistency.]</p>
12.1	Traffic calming has since been installed. This data sheet needs updating to reflect current situation.
13.0	A raised priority junction has since been installed. This data sheet needs updating to reflect current situation.
14.1	No comment.
14.2	<p>Entry to renewed eastbound contraflow should be made much more conspicuous - it is often difficult to see from New North Road junction especially when obscured by waiting large vehicles.</p> <p>Having contraflow track behind parking for such a short section is awkward. Consider putting car parking back on footway side and contraflow facility adjacent to carriageway.</p> <p>Investigate whether any section 106 funding remains available for rebuilding the contraflow facility. We assume the current substandard contraflow -- which was built at the same time as the Gainsborough Studios redevelopment -- was paid for from s106.</p>
14.3	Remove irrelevant photo of New North Road. Consider removing this data sheet.
15.1	This junction is due for signalisation, which we support. This data sheet needs updating to reflect current situation.
15.2	A cycle contraflow has since been installed leading from this junction westwards on Eagle Wharf Road. This data sheet needs updating to reflect current situation.
16.1	Eagle Wharf Road is now two-way from this junction westwards. This data sheet needs updating to reflect current situation.
16.2	Eagle Wharf Road is now two-way at this point. This data sheet needs updating to reflect current situation.
16.3	The new two-way working scheme in Eagle Wharf Road

	included improvements to this junction. This data sheet needs updating to reflect current situation.
17.1	No comment.