

London Cycling Campaign response to TfL (in Islington) Safer Junctions: A1 Holloway Road

29 August 2019

<https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/holloway-road/>

About the London Cycling Campaign

London Cycling Campaign (LCC) is a charity with more than 20,000 supporters of whom over 11,000 are fully paid-up members. We speak up on behalf of everyone who cycles or wants to cycle in Greater London; and we speak up for a greener, healthier, happier and better-connected capital.

This response was developed with input from LCC's borough groups.

General comments on this scheme:

- The recent Safer Junctions schemes proposed will improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists but the schemes fall far short of being transformational. They will not achieve "Vision Zero" safe crossings, nor will they make cycling or walking at these locations safe or comfortable.
- Given this, these junctions will likely need re-visiting in the near future if the Mayor's Transport Strategy aims are to be achieved. These schemes are neither being delivered rapidly and cheaply enough to represent a sensible "interim" approach, nor to a high enough quality to be permanent.
- The change in Healthy Streets Check score and the remaining five "critical issues" highlight how this scheme has failed to really deliver change. No Safer Junction should retain any critical issues.
- We fully support the response of our local borough group, which contains more specific detail.

Specific points about this scheme:

- It is marked that despite this scheme being supposedly put in place to deal with clear road danger issues, road danger in the scheme has not been strongly addressed. The scheme includes five Healthy Streets Check zero scores, also known as "critical issues". It should, as should every Safer Junction, feature none.
- Instead of boldly reducing road danger, or increasing walking, cycling and/or public transport use in line with the Mayor's Transport Strategy, this scheme offers welcome gains for pedestrians (signalised and often direct crossings), a mixed picture for buses (overall journey time improvements, primarily along Liverpool Road, but loss of bus lanes for sections on Holloway Road) and virtually nothing for those cycling (slight reduction in hook risks), despite 19 collisions with those cycling

in the last 3 years, at least one of which appears to be serious (2 November 2016, junction with Liverpool Road).

- There are approximately 2,000 people cycling along Holloway Road currently daily just north of these junctions, and over 3,000 slightly south (according to DfT traffic counts). There are high priority Strategic Cycling Analysis routes highlighted east-west across the area near this scheme and the Analysis also highlights that high current and potential cycle flows are found on Holloway Road at this point, on Palmer Place (site of another serious collision with a cyclist in the last three years), and on Drayton Park. It is simply unrealistic to assume that the current schemes planned in the area will remove significant numbers of those cycling from Holloway Road (not least because of the many amenities and destinations there, including the University). Therefore, safe cycling along Holloway Road urgently needs to be considered.
- Given the shift of traffic modes the Mayor's Transport Strategy is predicated on, it is surprising that this scheme (that is not badged as "interim" or "temporary") seems primarily designed to protect private motor traffic capacity. This is a particularly strange approach given that recent changes at both Archway, at the northern end of Holloway Road, and Highbury Corner, at the southern end, represent radical shifts away from private motor traffic in favour of other modes, and that with construction at Highbury ongoing, there can be no clarity as to whether previous or current motor traffic (and cycling etc.) volumes are likely to remain a good benchmark for future volumes and/or whether there is now an opportunity to reduce private motor traffic volumes on Holloway Road to provide more space and/or time for other modes here. TfL should, on this basis alone, consider implementing the pedestrian crossing improvements on a temporary basis, but monitoring and re-evaluating the scope for further, and bolder improvements for those walking and cycling once Holloway Road traffic levels settle.
- At the same time as major road danger issues are ignored in this scheme, retention of car loading bays have here been prioritised above bus lanes even. TfL and Islington Council should urgently work with all businesses along this stretch of Holloway Road to remove all loading bays from Holloway Road. And again, this indicates the priority given to road danger reduction, walking, cycling and public transport versus driving.
- There does not appear to be a clear need or rationale for the removal of sections of bus lane on Holloway Road, which will impact both buses and those currently cycling here negatively. The removal of bus lanes and increase in general traffic lanes at junctions particularly will create even more hostile road conditions for those cycling on Holloway Road.
- The replacement of the zebra on the junction with Liverpool Road with a signalised crossing is particularly welcome. As is the ban of a right turn to simplify movements here. However, without much further work to Liverpool Road itself, high driving speeds and aggressive behaviour at this junction will likely remain.

- The changes to George's Road and Eden Grove simply will not reduce their use as through motor traffic routes – indeed, the proposed right-turn pockets may worsen the issue, particularly given changes at the Liverpool Road junction. Filtering should instead be strongly considered for the area bounded by Holloway Road, the train tracks (to north and south) and Caledonian Road. And failure to do this could also impact on motor traffic volumes on the Highbury to Finsbury Park Cycleway Islington Council has recently consulted on.
- Moving the bus stop to north of Liverpool Road while relocating the pedestrian crossing to the junction is far from ideal. Students at London Metropolitan University exiting the bus will now be expected to walk back to the Liverpool Road junction to cross. It is likely this design will encourage some to cross informally between the university site and the bus stop, where the crossing used to be.
- The provision of a right-turn pocket into the petrol station along with removal of bus lane at this point risks drivers turning into the station not seeing pedestrians or those cycling across the access. This design should be reconsidered to minimise risks to pedestrians and those cycling, not to maximise ease of access to the petrol station for drivers.

General points about infrastructure schemes:

- The Mayor's Transport Strategy relies on a growth in cycle trips to keep London moving. This means infrastructure schemes must be designed to accommodate growth in cycling. Providing space for cycling is a more efficient use of road space than providing space for driving private motor vehicles, particularly for journeys of 5km or less. In terms of providing maximum efficiency for space and energy use, walking, cycling, then public transport are key.
- As demonstrated by the success of recent Cycle Superhighways and mini-Holland projects etc., people cycle when they feel safe. For cycling to become mainstream and enable all ages and abilities to cycle, a network of high-quality, direct routes separate from high volumes and/or speeds of motor vehicle traffic is required to/from all key destinations and residential areas in an area. Schemes should be planned, designed and implemented to maximise potential to increase journeys – with links to nearby amenities, residential centres, transport hubs considered from the outset.
- Spending money on cycling infrastructure has been shown to dramatically boost health outcomes in an area. Spending on cycling schemes outranks all other transport modes for return on investment according to a DfT study. Schemes which promote cycling meet TfL's "Healthy Streets" checklist. A healthy street is one where people choose to cycle.
- All schemes should be designed to enable people of all ages and abilities to cycle, including disabled people.

- Evidence from TfL and from many schemes in London, the UK and worldwide shows the economic benefits, including to businesses, to be found from enabling a wider range of people to cycle more. Further evidence shows how cycling schemes also benefit air quality and reduce climate changing emissions, as well as improving resident health outcomes and reducing inactivity, as mentioned above.
- LCC wants, as a condition of funding, all highway development designed to London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS), with a Cycling Level of Service (CLOS) rating of 70 or above, with all “critical issues” eliminated. Above 2,000 Passenger Car Unit (PCUs) motor vehicle movements per day, or 20mph motor traffic speeds, cycling should be physically separated from motor traffic.