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1 Background and Executive Summary

Transport for London (TfL) developed proposals to improve road safety for pedestrians and cyclists on the A1 Holloway Road in the Nag’s Head area, centred around a new pedestrian crossing outside the Nag’s Head Shopping Centre.

Many of the responses to the consultation only commented on the cycling element of the scheme, and did not mention the pedestrian crossing at all. After considering the feedback received, we have made the following changes to the scheme:

- A staggered pedestrian crossing located 22m further north than originally proposed, outside number 408 (eastern side) and number 363 (western side) Holloway Road.
- No northbound cycle lane will be implemented. The nearside northbound lane will be widened to 4m at the location of the crossing to facilitate overtaking by buses/cyclists.
- The bus stop will remain in its current location.
- The southbound cycle lane will be widened from 1.3m to 1.5m and the single red line will be converted to a double red line so it will remain unobstructed.
- A 0.5 m buffer will be added to the loading bays outside Selby’s and Iceland to help protect cyclists from being hit by vehicles opening their doors. These bays will be raised to footway level to enable pedestrians to use the space as part of the footway when they are not in use.
- Advanced stop lines will be added to Holloway Road arms of the main junctions.
- A single tree will need to be removed from the median island to ensure the signal heads of the proposed crossing are fully visible. No other trees will now be affected.

This consultation report focuses on the original proposals and the responses we received.

2 Introduction

2.1 Purpose of the original scheme
The main objective of the scheme is to install a pedestrian crossing on the A1 Holloway Road, enabling people to cross the road easily and safely and to improve access to businesses on the south-western side of the road.

2.2 Description of the original proposals
- New signalised pedestrian crossing outside the Nag’s Head Shopping Centre
- New cycle lanes in both directions
- Advanced stop lines added to the junctions of Holloway Road and Tollington Road/Camden Road and Seven Sisters/Parkhurst Road
- Resurfacing of the footway and carriageway

In order to make space for these improvements some other changes are proposed, including:

- Relocation of the northbound bus stop (Stop L) approximately 50m north of its existing location.
Changes to parking and loading provision, with an overall slight reduction in parking and loading availability

Loss of one small tree on the median island where the crossing will be located. There may also be the potential loss of one other small tree and two relatively mature trees due to kerb cutbacks required in order to relocate the bus stop.

Relocation of several items of street furniture including the removal of a redundant telephone box

3 The consultation

The consultation was intended to help TfL understand local opinion about the proposed changes to the road layout before making a final decision. Letters were sent to stakeholders and residents on 6 December 2013, asking for comments and feedback by 13 January 2014.

The objectives of the consultation were to:

- Give stakeholders and the public enough information about the scheme to allow them to give informed responses
- Gauge the level of support for or opposition to the scheme
- Help understand the background to concerns and objections
- Identify any new issues
- Allow stakeholders and the public to make suggestions
- Allow stakeholders and the public to influence the final decision

3.1 Who we consulted

The consultation was intended to seek the views of people living in the vicinity and especially those who would be using the crossing (ie residents) in addition to road users. We also consulted stakeholders including the affected Council, traffic police, London TravelWatch, Members of Parliament, Assembly Members and local interest groups. A list of the stakeholders we consulted is shown in Appendix C and a summary of their responses is given in Appendix D.

3.2 Consultation material, distribution and publicity

The consultation letter which explained the proposals was distributed to approximately 6000 properties and 95 stakeholders. The letter asked for the respondents to provide feedback and ask questions by 13 January 2014. A copy of this leaflet is shown in Appendix A and a map of the distribution area can be found in Appendix B.

We invited people to respond by emailing consultations@tfl.gov.uk, by post, or by completing an online survey at: https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/streets/a1-holloway-road

4 Overview of consultation responses

We received 157 responses to the consultation in total. Of these 145 were from members of the public and 12 were from stakeholders.

146 responses were submitted online, 10 were received by email and 1 was received by post.
The overall number of responses represented a 2.5% response rate to the consultation.

Of the responses received 15% said they supported the proposals, 82% said they did not support the proposals, and 3% did not specify support or opposition.

A closer look at the comments provided in the responses shows that dissatisfaction with the cycling element of the scheme dominated the feedback. Further analysis of the comments was carried out, to get a better idea of the support for the different parts of the scheme. The results are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Broadly in support</th>
<th>Broadly against</th>
<th>No comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall response</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian crossing</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements for cyclists</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our responses to the issues most commonly raised can be found in section 5.
5 Responses to issues raised

We asked people to let us know their views on the proposals. The table below shows the comments and suggestions made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The cycling facilities proposed are inadequate; the cycle lane is badly located and too narrow. | The consultation feedback that we received on this scheme showed that a majority of people were unhappy with the proposed cycle lanes. Unfortunately we are not able to install segregated cycle lanes at this location as suggested by many respondents (see below).

Installing the proposed 1.5m cycle lane would require kerb cutbacks of both the footway and the median island in order to retain two 3m wide general traffic lanes (the minimum allowable width) and provision for kerbside activity such as bus stops and loading. It would not be possible to install 2m wide cycle lanes without reducing the number of general traffic lanes from two to one in both directions. The A1 Holloway Road is a key corridor providing a north-south route into Central London for motor vehicles including freight traffic and buses. This section of Holloway Road is particularly important in terms of capacity as it forms the link between the two branches of the A503. Congestion is already a problem at this location, and the impact of effectively removing a traffic lane in each direction would increase the congestion on the corridor.

Cutting back the kerb to provide the 1.5m cycle lane would involve moving street furniture such as lamp columns, phone boxes and CCTV which significantly increases the overall costs of the scheme. Installing the cycle lanes also means parking and loading has to be removed or relocated onto the footway to ensure the cycle lane remains unobstructed and usable.

The responses to the consultation demonstrated clearly that the proposed cycle lanes were not welcomed by the majority of respondents. It has therefore been decided to progress the pedestrian crossing element of the scheme without the proposed northbound cycle lane. A review of the whole Nag's Head gyratory is currently underway, and the results of this review may result in significant changes being made to the way traffic moves around the Nag’s Head area. Cycling infrastructure on this section of Holloway Road will be looked at again as part of this review. |
Under the current scheme, the existing southbound cycle lane will still be widened from 1.2 to 1.5m; the southbound bus lane will be widened to facilitate overtaking by buses and cyclists and the single red line on the southbound carriageway will be made a double red line to keep the cycle lane clear, as in the original plans.

| **Why doesn’t this scheme do anything about the problems at the two main junctions, at Seven Sisters Road and Tollington Road?** | A full review of the Nag’s Head gyratory as a whole is currently underway as part of the Mayor’s Better Junctions programme. This study includes the two junctions with Holloway Road, at Tollington Road/Camden Road and Seven Sisters Road/Parkhurst Road. Several options are being considered, including the option of removing the Nag’s Head one-way system altogether and TfL is liaising with local stakeholders separately on this..

These are big, complex junctions and improving them for cyclists and pedestrians will involve making major changes which will require extensive design work and modelling. For this reason it was decided to progress the pedestrian crossing and other improvements at Nag’s Head separately, rather than delaying them until the completion of the Better Junctions review. The major junctions have therefore not been included in the scope for this scheme, other than the addition of ASLs on Holloway Road, and they are being studied separately.

| **Why can’t you put a segregated cycle lane in?** | It is recognised that full segregation is the option preferred by many cyclists, however at this location it is not possible due to the amount of space that would be required. Installing a segregated cycle lane to the left of kerbside activity as was raised in the consultation would require a floating bus stop arrangement on both the northbound and southbound carriageway. To install the island needed for a floating bus stop, the stop itself would have to be pushed into the general traffic lane. With bus flows of up to 42 buses per hour along this section of Holloway Road (around 1 bus every 1.5 minutes) this would effectively block the lane to other traffic, leaving just one lane for other motor vehicles in each direction.

The A1 Holloway Road is a key corridor providing a north-south route into Central London for motor vehicles including freight traffic and buses. This section of Holloway Road is particularly important in terms of capacity as it forms the link between the two branches of the A503. |
| **This scheme only looks at a short section of Holloway Road. Why can’t you install segregated cycle lanes down the whole length of the A1 Holloway Road?** | Congestion is already a problem at this location, and the impact of effectively removing a traffic lane would increase the congestion on the corridor.

As noted above, the A503 Nag’s Head gyratory is currently subject to a review as part of the Better Junctions programme. Several options are being considered, including the option of removing the one-way system altogether. The review is still at the feasibility stage and due to the size and complexity of the junctions involved will need to be extensively modelled before any decision is made. It is likely that any changes made to the Nag’s Head gyratory will affect traffic movements on Holloway Road and may enable further changes to this section of Holloway Road to be considered in future. |
|---|---|
| **TfL are committed to improving the cycling environment in London. In line with the Mayor’s Vision for Cycling we will work to install a network of direct, high-capacity cycle links, many of which will be fully segregated.** | Improvements for cyclists must be balanced against the need to maintain a reliable road network for all road users, particularly buses. The A1 Holloway Road corridor is heavily used by buses with up to 42 buses per hour using this link in some locations. Bus lanes are in place along most of this corridor which can also be used by cyclists, improving bus reliability and providing some protection for cyclists from general traffic. On much of Holloway Road there is insufficient road width for cycle lanes to be provided in addition to these bus lanes while retaining sufficient footway space and a general traffic lane for other motor vehicles. Kerbside space is also highly in demand with many businesses requiring space for loading.

For these reasons, at the moment it is not possible to install segregated cycle facilities along the whole length of the A1 Holloway Road corridor. TfL will continue to work to improve cycle facilities in this area through our Regional Improvement Programme and the quietways outlined in the Mayor’s Vision for Cycling. |
<p>| <strong>A cyclist was killed on Holloway Road in 2011 just south of this location when someone opened a door on a vehicle.</strong> | We are aware that there is a risk to cyclists when cycle lanes run immediately next to parking and loading, as cyclists can be knocked by people opening the doors of their vehicles without looking. For this reason we have included 0.5m buffers next to all the parking and loading in the proposals, |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>car door without looking. This scheme doesn't solve this problem.</td>
<td>to minimise the possibility of door-hits. A cyclist cycling in the middle of the 1.5m cycle lane would be more than a metre away from any vehicle using the parking and loading facilities. The fatality referred to in responses to the consultation occurred on Holloway Road near the junction with Jackson Road. We have a separate scheme planned here to make the location safer for cyclists. We are planning to implement this scheme later in the current financial year and a full public consultation on this scheme will be carried out in due course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why have full-width ASLs been provided on Holloway Road at the junctions with Tollington and Seven Sisters Roads?</td>
<td>TfL consider ASLs to be an improvement to the cycling environment. They allow cyclists to get to the front of the traffic where they can be first to move off when the lights change. Full-width ASLs give more space to cyclists and prevent the confusion which can be caused by the double stop line necessary for a half-width ASL. In addition, in this instance, full-width ASLs are proposed on the southbound arm of the junction with Seven Sisters Road and the northbound arm of the junction with Tollington Road because although there is no right/left turn at these junctions a very confident cyclist may want to get into position at this point to make that movement at the next junction. These major junctions are being reviewed under the Better Junctions programme (see above), which will look at these junctions in more depth and investigate a number of options for improving cycle safety, including new cycle highway design ideas such as two-stage right turns and advance start signals for cyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why can't you remove the median island to free up space, or at least get rid of the guardrail?</td>
<td>The central reservation needs to be retained to support the signal heads at the major junctions and to provide a median island for the pedestrian crossing. Removing it would free up a small amount of space, but would mean any pedestrian crossing installed would have to be direct, without an island. The width of Holloway Road at this location would mean build-outs would be required to ensure a safe crossing distance, which would lead to a greater overall loss of space than if the median island was retained. As discussed below, this would also have a significant impact on traffic flow and would mean pedestrians would have to wait much longer to cross. Removing the central reservation would also entail the loss of the seven trees currently situated there; removing these would have a significant negative impact on the quality of the urban realm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TfL are committed to removing pedestrian guardrail wherever possible. A safety study of Holloway Road at this location was carried out in 2009 to investigate whether the guardrail on the central reservation could be removed. This study recommended that the guardrail be retained to discourage informal crossing which would be dangerous at this location. The outcome of this study informed our decision to install the proposed signalised pedestrian crossing instead to ensure that pedestrians are able to cross safely.

<p>| Why is the crossing staggered rather than straight? | The proposed crossing is staggered rather than straight due to concerns about the capacity impact of a straight crossing on the road network as a whole. This is a critical section of the A1 as it lies between the two large junctions with the A503 (the gyratory system), and the very large turning movements between the A1 and A503 are a significant constraint on capacity. The staggered crossing can be sequenced so that it runs at the same time as the two existing crossings at the major junctions, minimising the impacts on traffic flow and bus journey times. By installing a staggered crossing, the wait time for pedestrians can also be kept to a minimum, because the crossing can operate every time the lights at the major junctions change. A straight across crossing would be able to operate less frequently to mitigate the impact of stopping traffic out of sequence with other nearby signals. While pedestrians would be able to cross in a single movement, they would have to wait significantly longer to do so. |
| Could the crossing not be located in the middle of this section of Holloway Road? | The location of the crossing was determined by the need to ensure adequate sightlines between pedestrians waiting at the crossing and vehicles approaching the crossing, and also to ensure that the signal heads for the crossing are visible to vehicles in time for them to stop. There was concern that the presence of a bus stop downstream of the crossing in both directions would limit visibility when buses were at the stop. Following the consultation we have reviewed the design and some modifications will be made to allow us to put the crossing 22m further north than originally planned, placing it more centrally in the parade of shops. As a result we no longer have to relocate the bus stop. |
| There are other crossings nearby, | This crossing has been requested by Islington council and many of the businesses in Nag’s Head for some time. At the moment, Holloway Road can only be crossed at the main junctions, which |
| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>why is this crossing needed?</th>
<th>are approximately 200m apart. The presence of guardrail on the median island makes it impossible to cross in between these points. It was felt that the lack of crossing opportunities caused severance between the eastern and western sides of Holloway Road, with businesses on the western side in particular losing custom because of the difficulty of crossing the road. Surveys of pedestrian movements showed a substantial proportion of people were walking to the crossings and having to double back to access businesses on the other side of the road. It is felt that there is sufficient demand for a crossing at this location to make it worth installing and that it will improve permeability and the pedestrian environment in line with the Mayor’s Transport Strategy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The crossing should be installed without removing any trees.</td>
<td>TfL take the responsibility to protect trees on its roads seriously and do not remove trees unless absolutely necessary. Following a review of the design the crossing will be located 22m further north than originally planned, which removes the need to remove two mature trees on the footway. Unfortunately, it would not be possible to install the crossing without removing a tree from the median island. The tree would obscure the signal heads of the crossing and make it unsafe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloway Road should be given a speed limit of 20mph</td>
<td>TfL supports the introduction of 20mph limits on appropriate roads and has supported Islington in the introduction of a 20mph limits on all borough roads. At the moment this does not extend to TfL roads which have historically been major arteries for traffic and therefore may not be suitable for 20mph speed restrictions. However, it is recognised that the character of roads changes along their length, and that as a town-centre Holloway Road at Nag’s Head may potentially be suitable for a 20mph limit. TfL is currently trialling 20mph limits on its roads elsewhere in London and the outcome of these trials will inform future decisions on the appropriateness of making more TfL roads 20mph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why does the scheme propose to move parking and loading onto the footway at the expense of pedestrians?</td>
<td>It was planned to move some parking and loading onto the footway to address the loss of loading space caused by changing single red lines to double red lines, necessary to ensure that the proposed northbound cycle lane remained unobstructed by vehicles. Following our review of the consultation responses the scheme will now go ahead without the provision of the northbound cycle lane and no footway space will be lost to pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Conclusion

We have considered the responses to the consultation and have decided to proceed with the scheme incorporating the design changes as indicated in section 1.

Some respondents requested changes to the proposals which we have concluded are not possible to implement. Details of our response to these requests are shown in our response to issues raised in section 3.

6.1 Next steps
Work to resurface the eastbound footway has been completed as part of regular TfL maintenance activities. This has included the changes to the loading bays described above. TfL has programmed the rest of the work to install the pedestrian crossing and to resurface the carriage way for August 2014. We will write to local residents and stakeholders with details of construction work nearer the time.
Appendix A – Copy of the consultation letter and map

Transport for London

4 December 2013

Dear Sir/Madam,

Transport for London (TfL) has developed proposals to improve road safety for pedestrians and cyclists on the A1 Holloway Road in the Nag’s Head area.

The main objective of the scheme is to put in place a pedestrian crossing on the A1 Holloway Road, enabling people to cross the road easily and safely and to improve access to businesses on the south-western side of the road.

In summary, the proposed measures include the following:

- New signalised pedestrian crossing outside the Nag’s Head Shopping Centre
- New cycle lanes in both directions
- Advanced stop lines added to the junctions of Holloway Road and Tollington Road/Camden Road and Seven Sisters/Parkhurst Road
- Resurfacing of the footway and carriageway

In order to make space for these improvements some other changes are required. These include:

- Relocation of the northbound bus stop (Stop L) approximately 50m north of its existing location
- Changes to parking and loading provision, with and overall slight reduction in parking and loading availability
- Loss of one small tree on the median island where the crossing will be located. There may also be the potential loss of one other small tree and two relatively mature trees due to kerb cutbacks required in order to relocate the bus stop.
- Relocation of several items of street furniture including the removal of a redundant telephone box

The proposals are shown on the attached map. In addition to these proposals, an informal pedestrian crossing with a central refuge island is planned for the A1 Holloway Road adjacent to Jackson Road.

MAYOR OF LONDON
All of the measures that we propose are subject to change as a result of this consultation. Given no unforeseen issues, it is anticipated that the scheme will be implemented in Spring 2014.

**How to comment on the proposals:**

For further information or to let us know your views, please visit our website at: [https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/streets/a1-holloway-road](https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/streets/a1-holloway-road). You can also contact TfL’s Consultation Team at the above address or by emailing [consultations@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:consultations@tfl.gov.uk).

Please let us know your views **by 6 January 2014**.

Yours sincerely

Sara Peters  
Consultation and Engagement Manager  
**Consultation Team**
Proposed improvements at the Nag’s Head on A1 Holloway Road

KEY

- Proposed road marking
- Proposed tactile paving
- Proposed new or existing cycle lane
- Raised surface
- Kerb realignment

Advanced stop line

Loading bay raised to footway level

Proposed extension of bus lane by 1.5m

Proposed 1.5m wide cycle lane

Loading bay raised to footway level

Advanced stop line

Proposed 1.5m wide cycle lane

Existing parking bay removed

Parking bay relocated onto footway

Proposed loading bay

Relocated bus stop

New signalised crossing location.
Removal of small tree.

New footway level loading bay

Transport for London
Appendix B – Letter distribution area

Appendix C – List of stakeholders consulted

London TravelWatch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elected Members</th>
<th>Islington North</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Corbyn MP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Thornberry MP</td>
<td>Islington South and Finsbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennette Arnold</td>
<td>Assembly Member for Islington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Shawcross</td>
<td>Chair Assembly Transport Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Pidgeon</td>
<td>Assembly Transport Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Borwick</td>
<td>Assembly Transport Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Copley</td>
<td>Assembly Transport Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Evans</td>
<td>Assembly Transport Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren Johnson</td>
<td>Assembly Transport Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murad Qureshi</td>
<td>Assembly Transport Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onkar Sahota</td>
<td>Assembly Transport Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Tracey</td>
<td>Assembly Transport Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Kelly</td>
<td>Cllr Finsbury Ward – Islington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael O’Sullivan</td>
<td>Cllr Finsbury Ward – Islington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Sidnell</td>
<td>Cllr Finsbury Ward – Islington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Debono</td>
<td>Cllr Highbury West Ward – Islington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other stakeholders included:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Islington</td>
<td>LCC - Islington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Forum for the Elderly</td>
<td>The British Dyslexia Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign for Better Transport</td>
<td>National Grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian People’s Disability Alliance</td>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of British Drivers</td>
<td>Road Haulage Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Mobility Unit</td>
<td>British Motorcyclists Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Flag Group</td>
<td>MIND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDF Energy</td>
<td>Motorcycle Industry Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixty Plus</td>
<td>Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Cttee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Streets</td>
<td>Disability Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke Association</td>
<td>Islington Transport Aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London City Airport</td>
<td>Joint Committee on Mobility of Blind and Partially Sighted People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNID</td>
<td>Freight Transport Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Councils</td>
<td>CBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Royal Parks</td>
<td>Motorcycle Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Water</td>
<td>Royal Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA Motoring Trust</td>
<td>AA Public Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Children’s Bureau</td>
<td>London Ambulance Service NHS Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Older People’s Strategy Group</td>
<td>RADAR London Access Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of London Authority</td>
<td>RNIB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide Dogs for the Blind Association</td>
<td>BT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D – Responses from statutory bodies and other stakeholders
We asked stakeholders to let us know their views on the proposals. The stakeholder comments are summarised below.

London Borough of Islington – Support

This response sets out Islington Council’s response to the proposal for a new pedestrian crossing across the Holloway Road in the Nag’s Head Town Centre.

The Council, the Nag’s Head Town Centre Management Group and local businesses have long been lobbying for an additional pedestrian crossing across Holloway Road in the Nag’s Head Town Centre. The crossing will facilitate pedestrian circulation in the town centre and improve trade for businesses on the west side of Holloway Road. The regenerative effect could bring additional local jobs to the borough. We therefore welcome Transport for London’s consultation on a proposal to introduce a new pedestrian crossing.

It has come to our attention that cycling groups are unhappy with the proposed design, and have asked for the introduction of segregated lanes to reduce the risk of cycle accidents caused by opening doors of parked vehicles. The Council shares this concern and would like to see cycle safety considered as part of any proposals for the redesign of roads.

However, it is our understanding that introducing segregated cycle lanes is not straightforward and could lead to considerable additional loss of car parking and space for servicing/loading which are essential for the successful operation of the town centre. Alternatively, traffic lanes would have to be removed to make space for segregated cycle lanes, which is likely to have a significant impact on traffic. Whilst not insurmountable, we believe that the complexity of addressing these challenges would result in a significant delay to the delivery of the much needed and long awaited new pedestrian crossing.

Fortunately, the recently commenced feasibility study into the removal of the Nag’s Head one-way system offers an excellent opportunity to review the design of the road layout of this part of Holloway Road. This section of Holloway Road forms the centre of the Nag’s Head one-way system, between its junctions with Seven Sisters/Parkhurst Road and Tollington Road/Camden Road. It therefore logically follows that the road layout of this part of Holloway Road is studied in conjunction with the proposed changes to the one-way system itself.
Another concern relates to the loss of trees (i.e. potential loss of two small trees and two mature trees). We would strongly recommend that the removal of healthy trees only be considered as a last resort if no other design solution can be found that would retain these trees. If there are no other solutions, the number of trees to be removed should be kept to a minimum and all retained trees should receive appropriate protection for the duration of the project. Furthermore, a suitable number of replacement trees should be agreed to offset the loss of canopy area (e.g. four/five replacement trees should be identified and agreed at the earliest opportunity).

The Council welcomes the proposed pedestrian crossing across Holloway Road. However, to improve safety for cyclists, both along the Nag's Head gyratory and on Holloway Road (in the town centre), we urge you to explore the possibility of introducing segregated cycle lanes as part of the Nag’s Head gyratory design work for which we understand the physical changes could be introduced within the next three to four years. We would also like to see the impact of the proposed crossing on trees avoided as far as possible or appropriately mitigated.

**Penn Road Resident’s Association – Support**

We agree with the proposal for a crossing but not the location on your plan. Our agreement in point 6 below is with this caveat, you don't allow for this in your phrasing.

A safe place to cross this busy stretch of road is a sensible idea and would help to stimulate business on the south west side of Holloway Road. Placing it further north so it crosses the middle of this section of Holloway Road would be better, your proposal has is sited off-centre for no apparent reason. A centrally placed crossing would encourage more people to use the crossing regardless of which direction they are approaching from, whereas the off-set crossing might well deter people from the north end. This would also cause less disruption during construction as you don't have to remove the tree or move the north bound bus stops, saving time and money.

A great idea to put in the cycle lane. A properly sectioned off cycle lane with a kerb would offer greater safety for cyclists and encourage drivers to give them more attention.

**Southwark Living Streets – Not in support**

Overall this is a really disappointing set of proposals which fails to balance in any way the role of the Holloway Rd as a high street/town centre (its place function) with its existing and dominant movement function. As such it feels totally against the spirit and intention of Mayor of London Roads Task Force work which sought to lay out a far more balanced approach to these issues in an environment that is so heavily used by those on foot. At the very least it is disappointing that no attempt has been made to design the road to 20mph with the changes or to remove carriageway capacity and reallocate it to pedestrians who are the life blood of the high street.

Equally disappointing is the poor quality of the proposed cycling infrastructure which appears to have learned almost nothing from the Vision For Cycling with the proposed use of narrow (1.5 metre) non-mandatory cycle lanes. It is a real shame that in spite of the visionary work that is proposed at places like the Elephant & Castle and an openness to incorporate 20mph on the TLRN, such a timid approach has been used that will do little to benefit this important high street economically or improve the safety and comfort
of vulnerable road users. These proposals be reviewed and should not be taken forward in their current form.

**LCC Infrastructure Review Group – Not in support**

We have been involved with the London Cycling Campaign's Junction Review Group (now Infrastructure Review Group) from it's inception and are appalled TfL are still coming up with dangerous designs such as this.

There are so many issues with these proposals I'm not sure where to start.

Advanced stop lanes are extremely dangerous and should not be introduced into any more junctions. They are the area of the blind spot of truck. Also many people riding bicycles find it scary to cross two never mind 3 lanes of traffic. Instead a protected cycle track of 2m width minimum plus separate timings to prevent left hooks. It is essential that left turning motor vehicles are not allowed to go at the same time as straight on cyclists otherwise there will be more deaths similar to the ones at Bow through left hooks. You also need to aid cyclists that are turning right in a protected Dutch style two stage turn.

Traffic lights need to be demand responsive. As cyclists are in their own track, this helps to tell when there are cyclists there rather than other modes of transport, and you can automatically adjust the timings for the demand of all traffic. This ties in with the previous point re separating left turning vehicles from straight on and right turning cyclists. This is standard practice in The Netherlands where signals will even turn red and straight back to green if there is still more cyclists there to promote cycling and reduce the probability of cyclists jumping the red light.

**Dog leg crossing example**

Why are TfL still introducing dog leg crossings? (Dog leg crossings are where you cross half way, walk sideways for a bit, and then cross the rest of the way). Have any of the designers or traffic engineers taken a look at how the current dog leg crossings are being used in London? Spending just a few minutes will show that they are not being used as designed. People don't do the sideways walk as designed and just continue walking straight on as that is the fastest route to their destination. Adding railing back in is not a solution as pedestrians just walk around then, and also there is potential for pedestrians and cyclists to be crushed against them by motor vehicles. By building the crossings the way that users actually use them, will mean that the central reservation can be removed thus making room for a safe cycle track to be put in instead, and also make it safer for pedestrians. I don't see motor vehicles having to do a sideways jump so why should pedestrians?

Why is the central reservation needed? Is it still there to make it feel safe for drivers to go fast along the road knowing that there won't be a car coming the other direction on their side of the road?

Heading south east why does 2 lanes turn into a bus lane plus a very wide lane that may be wide enough for 2 small vehicles, which later turns into a cycle lane plus 3 lanes of traffic? The merging and splitting of traffic lanes causes traffic tailbacks and more collisions. Thus minimising the potential for lane changes would help to make the roads safer. Mixing cyclists in a bus lane is not going to encourage an inexperienced cyclist, or even an experienced cyclist who is scared of being run over after too many near misses.
in the past, to cycling in this location. This is why a protected cycle track is needed.

Why are the cycle lanes to the right of the bus stops and the loading bays? This creates a significant dooring and collision risk and will result in injuries or death of cyclists. Best practice in other countries such as The Netherlands shows that the cyclists should be between the pavement and the motor vehicles, including parking and loading motor vehicles, as this is the safest location.

Why is a 1.5m cycle lane seen as sufficient width? This does not allow for space for cyclists to be able to overtake safely in the lane, especially if one of them has a cargo bike or trailer. 1.5m may be the minimum, as specified by the London Design Standards section 4.2.7, however it does also stipulate 2m or more where space permits in several places in the document. In this instance there is enough space here to allow the 2 or more metres width.

Would you allow your 8 year old child to cycle on this road, or be happy for your 80 year old mother to cycle here after the proposals have been implemented. Would that be happy walking here? If not, the design isn't good enough and you need to go back to the drawing board. Please stop this consultation and go back to the drawing board before wasting more time and money on dangerous designs.

**Hackney Cyclists – Not in support**

Completely woeful. Why are we seeing the same poor designs over and over again? TfL and Met Police are currently investing huge resources in encouraging cyclists not to pass HGV's on the nearside, and here is another design doing exactly the opposite. A man was killed less than 400m from this proposal by someone opening a car door into his path, yet here TfL are providing exactly more of the same design that got him killed. Londoners need new designs that will encourage more of them to cycle and walk. The new crossing point is the only welcome part of this design.

Why are you keeping the island strip down the middle of the road? What possible use is it? Waste of use-able roadway, that could help provide proper protected cycle ways. Poor.

**Imperial College London – Not in support**

No protection for cyclists from three lanes of fast moving motor traffic. Additional hazards from parking and loading bays adjacent cycle lane.

**Richmond Cycling Group – Not in support**

This is a really disappointing plan - it repeats many of the issues with the existing road layouts without doing anything to really encourage more people to get on a bike.

We agree with the response produced by the GB Cycle Embassy (http://www.cycling-embassy.org.uk/news/2014/01/05/embassy-response-to-nags-head-consultation) - if a scheme like this appeared in Richmond we'd be fighting it tooth and nail.
London Forum – Part support

In principle I and the members I have spoken to about the scheme support what is proposed, as far as it goes. However, people crossing the road wish to do so in a straight line and in particular resist diversions which add to the time taken or distance travelled. The staggered crossing will not work as intended because people will cross away from designated crossings in order to avoid going backwards in the middle.

I understand that the proposals sent with your email are only a small part of what might be done, and certainly they do relatively little for bus users and pedestrians. What is needed is for the extensive gyratory (running from just north of Caledonian Road station to Finsbury Park) be removed for two way working to be restored to all roads.

Cycling Embassy of GB – Not in support

We have serious concerns about the design being proposed at the Nag’s Head junction.

In particular, the positioning of a cycle lane directly outside parking bays is troubling. In 2011 Sam Harding was killed after being deflected into the path of a bus by a driver opening his car door, just a few hundred yards from this junction. The design being suggested will expose people cycling to an unacceptable degree of risk. On a road like this, provision for cycling should be located between the footway and any parking, with the parking acting as both subjective and objective protection from passing traffic.

We are also concerned by the use of Advanced Stop Lines (ASLs) at the junctions. Two of these are tokenistic, as no right turn is possible northbound onto Tollington Road, and no right turn is possible southbound onto Parkhurst Road. There is absolutely no point in providing ASLs for right turns that cannot be executed.

Conflicting movements between motor vehicles turning left and cyclists progressing straight ahead are only partially solved by ASLs when signals are red. They are of no benefit when signals are green, and furthermore (with lead-in lanes provided, as in the Nag’s Head design) will actually encourage people into dangerous positions on the nearside of large vehicles that may be about to turn. At the recent inquest into the death of Katherine Giles, the coroner noted:

"I CAN HIGHLIGHT ONCE AGAIN THE DANGER OF COMING UPON THE NEAR-SIDE OF LORRIES. IT’S BEEN RECOGNISED AS CAUSING MANY DEATHS IN LONDON”.

Yet designs like the one being proposed here will encourage precisely this behaviour - moving up the inside of lorries, and other vehicles.

The scheme, therefore, fails to address (and may even exacerbate) dangers posed to people cycling on this section of Holloway Road. Importantly, it also does very little to make cycling a realistic prospect for the vast majority of people who do not feel willing or able to cycle in London. Cycling in close proximity to heavy traffic on a road with a 30mph limit is far from attractive.

We would suggest, instead, cycle tracks that run behind the parking bays, with properly designed bus stop bypasses. On the continental model, that are now starting to be implemented in London. These cycle tracks should provide physical protection from
motor traffic, along with separation in time at the junctions - namely, cycle traffic progressing ahead on green signals, while turning traffic is held at red.

If these kinds of changes cannot be implemented - changes that would make a genuine difference to the safety and comfort of those who might choose to cycle in the area - there is little point spending any money here at all. In the words of the Mayor’s own Vision for Cycling

"Timid, half-hearted improvements are out - we will do things at least adequately, or not at all."

**Islington Living Streets – Did not indicate support/not support**

On behalf of Islington Living Streets from the perspective of people on foot, we welcome the addition of an extra crossing at the Nag’s Head as this will help reduce community severance caused by a multi-lane highway ploughing through a residential and shopping area.

However we are concerned that all crossings across Holloway Rd are staggered. This means pedestrians cannot cross straight across the road and causes delay to pedestrians encouraging risky crossing behaviour as pedestrians get frustrated by the two stage crossing process.

**Islington Cyclist Action Group**

It’s been hard to get a consensus on this and one of our members commented “This is a very dangerous stretch of road for cyclists. And it will remain so after this intervention.” A particular disappointment is that there is still a very real opportunity for cyclists to be ‘doored’ in this scheme which was how Samuel Harding was tragically killed. We assume you have seen the blog [http://aseasyasridingabike.wordpress.com/2013/12/16/the-nags-head-scheme-are-tfl-paying-any-attention-at-all/](http://aseasyasridingabike.wordpress.com/2013/12/16/the-nags-head-scheme-are-tfl-paying-any-attention-at-all/). This is not very positive about TfL and doesn’t represent ICAG’s views; but does represent views of cyclists who have taken the time to comment on the blog.

**Nag’s Head Town Centre Management Group – Support**

I am writing on behalf of the Nags Head Town Centre Management Group (NHTCMG) to strongly support the proposal for the new Nag’s Head Town Centre pedestrian crossing on Holloway Road. This is something that we have been working on and lobbying for, for 9 years. Over that period there have been various reasons why the scheme has been delayed including implementation of the scheme at the same time as the proposed Cycle Superhighway (route 12).

This is one of the NHTCMG main priorities and carries the full backing of Islington Council. We were given a firm commitment last year by TfL that the scheme would definitely be delivered by spring 2014 and that there would be no further delays. This was confirmed by TfL at our AGM in September 2013. Despite a few issues regarding loading/unloading, there is overwhelming support for the new crossing by businesses in the town centre. The new crossing is crucial in improving pedestrian movement in the town centre and trade for businesses on the western side of the road who have suffered since the central guard rail was installed some years ago. We believe that the crossing
will attract inward investment and therefore lead to the creation of additional local jobs in the area and help secure the town centres survival.

It has come to our attention that some cycling groups are unhappy with the proposed crossing. The NHTCMG is of course concerned about the safety of cyclists on the Holloway road and this was discussed along with the other changes during our consultations on the crossing proposals. We would generally support safety initiatives. The principal suggestion made by some of the objectors is the use of segregated cycle lanes and/or a protected cycle lane on the inside of the cars. Other objectors are, however opposed to this plan, noting that pedestrians are likely to walk into cyclists’ path to get to their cars, that passengers are less likely than drivers to look out before opening their doors in the path of a cyclist and that the cyclists are unable to move into the pedestrian’s zone to keep a car door's width away from vehicles, as they can do on roads.

One of the commentators, who is active in the borough and is familiar with the area thinks that it would be confusing and a piecemeal solution to segregate cycle and vehicular traffic over this short length of road and notes that this can more sensibly be resolved as a whole along with the major review of all the junctions in the Nag’s Head gyratory now being undertaken.

We endorse this statement and believe that, while we remain concerned about the safety of cyclists, the ambivalent views expressed in recent comments should be carried forward to a more thorough review of the provision for cyclists in the area (and indeed, as many of the commentators have noted, of London-wide provision and attitudes).

In the meantime, the crossing is desperately needed for Town Centre users on foot; there are huge benefits for pedestrians, children, mothers with buggies, wheelchair users and the elderly as well as for cyclists. We believe that it should proceed along the planned programme.

We would also be concerned about the possible loss of trees and would request that this is avoided if at all possible.