

Appendix F: Comments of Critical Friends

Comments of Critical Friends	Designer's response
<p><u>Urban Design London</u></p> <p>This scheme forms part of the Enfield Mini-Holland study, which seeks to deliver borough wide transformational change for cycling. The designer presented the preliminary scheme design for proposed cycle infrastructure on the A105 corridor between the junction of Alderman's Hill and the A105 and the junction at Fox Lane to the north.</p> <p>The A105 is an important corridor linking Palmers Green and Winchmore Hill to Enfield Town Centre, the borough's primary shopping destination. The A105 corridor is approximately 6km long and forms part of the TfL Strategic Route Network (SRN). The A105 here is generally fronted by ground floor shops and businesses with upper floor residential properties. The buildings are generally of good quality with some high quality buildings including the Fox PH at the junction of the A105 and Fox Lane.</p> <p>The primary objective of the scheme is to get nervous/timid cyclists onto bikes and therefore segregated cycle facilities are proposed along the corridor. The designer is considering light segregation – akin to Royal College Street, where cycle segregation has been achieved using planters and rubber 'armadillos' and bus boarders have been designed to provide a continuous cycle route.</p> <p>The panel were encouraged by the design approach which seeks to provide continuous segregated cycle infrastructure along the street with recourse to intrusive heavily engineered segregation which could detract from the character and quality of the street. The designer was urged to provide the right balance between cycle provision and the public realm given that the area is very close to the town centre and subject to high pedestrian footfall. Footway space should not be reallocated for cycle infrastructure and</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

the designer should ensure that the scheme does not negatively impact on the pedestrian comfort levels. Where the scheme currently proposes to take space from the footway the designer was encouraged to consider reducing the cycleway at this point, perhaps to 1.5m wide, to strike the balance between pedestrian comfort and cycle provision.

The panel welcomed the designer's decision to consider a 20mph speed limit for the corridor. Reduced traffic speed will have a beneficial impact on pedestrians and cyclists and reduce the severity of collisions.

The panel recommended that the designer removes all unnecessary white lines from the scheme and apply this to the corridor in general. TfL have recently published research on removing centre lines from streets which has led to reduced traffic speeds. The panel also recommended that coloured surfacing should not be used, it is detrimental to the quality of the streetscape and incurs additional maintenance costs in comparison to asphalt surfacing. A cautionary note was sounded on the design of light segregation and the panel recommended that 'wands' are not specified as they are unattractive and prone to traffic damage.

The retention of car parking and the provision of cycle lanes will create a barrier to pedestrian crossing and it was recommended that the designers provide more formal and informal crossing opportunities by breaking up long sections of car parking through footway buildouts and the introduction of tree planting, particularly at side junction entry treatments. Pedestrian crossings should be considered in more detail and the designer should consider the function and design of the proposed kerb heights throughout the corridor.

There followed a discussion which focused on the junction of the A105 and Aldermans Hill. This junction provides an important link

Cycle lanes have been reduced from 2.0m to minimise the impact on the footway. There are some locations where a slight reduction in footway was required but this has been minimised as much as possible.

The reduction in speed limit along the corridor formed part of the consultation questionnaire. However, there was limited public support for this element of the scheme. However, with the reduction in carriageway widths, it is felt that this will in itself reduce free flow traffic speeds along the corridor, between junctions and bus stops

Coloured surfacing is not proposed in the design, where cycle lanes are at footway levels, alternative materials will be used to clearly demarcate between the footway and the cycle lanes.

White lines will be kept to a minimum. However, these are required on the approach to junctions and crossings. A detailed review of road markings will take place at the detailed design stage

The proposed light segregation will be armadillo/orca style segregation, which will be low level.

The designs have sought to retain as much parking as possible whilst introducing safe, continuous cycle facilities. Additional crossings have been introduced along the corridor to mitigate the loss of informal crossings, improving the provision for pedestrians in these locations. The detailing of proposed kerb heights will form part of the detailed design process.

A review of the section between Green Lanes and Palmers Green station was carried out. However, the bridge structure

<p>between the A105 and Palmers Green town centre and the rail station which lies approximately 100m to the west. The panel urged the designer to review the approach taken here and consider how cycle infrastructure can be provided up to the station itself.</p> <p>The junction is cherished by the local community and affectionately known as the triangle, due to the triangular piece of land carved out by the traffic lanes. Although the triangle is home to the town clock, the public realm is of very poor quality. Severed by traffic, the space is enclosed by pedestrian guardrailling with cctv cameras, lighting columns and service boxes contributing to the poor environment.</p> <p>The scheme provides an opportunity to review the nature and quality of this space and the potential to design a high quality public realm here with seating, street trees and an improved setting of the town clock. The panel urged the designer to develop more coherent design for this important junction to provide meaning and identity to the town centre.</p> <p>The panel recommended that the designer prepare a single agreed scheme for public consultation. This provides the opportunity to present a well-considered scheme with multiple benefits including public realm and environmental benefits which can be delivered as part of the cycle infrastructure works. Preparing several options for public consultation can be confusing and dilute the central message and integrity of the proposal.</p>	<p>currently has trief kerbing and a wall, which would need to be removed. This would involve changes to the bridge structure which would be very expensive and therefore this option was not taken forward.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The proposed option which retained the triangle is being taken forward and there will be significant improvements to the public realm in this area, developed in conjunction with the local community.</p> <p>Multiple options were taken forward to consultation at two locations only.</p>
<p><u>Metropolitan Police Traffic Management Unit</u></p> <p>1. Light segregation Armadillos/ Orcas are a potential loss of control hazard, particularly to powered two wheelers. This risk becomes more apparent as the retro reflective markings on the objects become worn, and road dirt makes them more difficult to distinguish from the surrounding road surface. They are effectively road furniture, rather than a sign or marking as specified in TSRGD, and must be seen as a potential hazard when placed</p>	

in the actual carriageway where they may be struck by passing vehicles if drivers are insufficiently warned of their presence. This issue has come up elsewhere, and whilst we would not require them to be set back the usual minimum of 450mm from the kerb/road edge, there should be sufficient guidance to minimise the risk of vehicles striking them. Provided a solid white line is provided between passing general traffic and the Armadillos/ Orcas, we would see this as sufficient warning for drivers. If placed in this way, any vehicle striking one of these objects would therefore have already travelled beyond the confines of the marked carriageway. These objects should not be placed on top of any solid white marking as this would effectively change the solid line to a broken one, and render the marking unenforceable. The white line marking the nearside edge of the carriageway and the Armadillos/ Orcas must be seen as two separate features.

2. Should buffer strips be used at bus stop boarders?

This would have to be looked at on a case by case basis. There is a clear risk of unsighted passengers alighting from buses directly into the path of a cyclist. Wherever the footway space exists to move the cycle lane back from the kerb edge this should be the default position, even if this means some inconsistency with stops where space is more restricted. In every case where the cycle lane runs directly along the kerb edge at bus stop boarders the traffic authority must be able to demonstrate why no alternative was possible. As a minimum, cycle symbols accompanied by direction arrows should be clearly marked to give bus passengers some warning of the possible presence of cyclists.

3. Positioning of cycle lanes

Cycle groups have requested that cycle lanes be relocated between the parking and footway rather than outside the parking (pages 5 – 7 of the consultation are a good example). In our view, the default position should be for the cycle lane to run along the outside of parking bays. With cycle lanes running along the inside of parking areas there is a dooring risk on both sides of any parked vehicle and nearside passengers

A mandatory cycle lane marking (solid white line) will be provided between the passing general traffic and the cycle lane.

Where there is scope to provide a 'buffer strip' at bus stop boarders one has been provided with a minimum width of 0.5m.

Additional signage/markings will be used to at bus stop boarders for both pedestrians and cyclists.

As a result of a number of responses to the consultation, the cycle lanes have been relocated between the footway and the

(especially children) are likely to be even less aware of this than drivers. Also, drivers turning into or out of junctions or premises are likely to have less visibility or awareness of cyclists using a lane to the nearside of parked cars. An offside cycle lane does introduce a risk of cars entering or leaving parking bays colliding with cyclists, but in residential areas these movements are likely to be less frequent than turns into and out of side roads.

4. Positioning of Armadillos/ Orcas
As per above, Armadillos/ Orcas should not be placed on top of any solid lane marking. This is the view of both Department for Transport and the Metropolitan Police.

parking along the corridor, to provide a consistent provision, similar to that of the proposed bus stops and retail areas. At all parking locations a buffer strip of 0.5m has been used to mitigate the risk of dooring. Parking is also offset from side roads to provide visibility on the approach. The designs will be subject to a formal safety audit, which will review this particular element of the scheme.

Armadillos/ Orcas will not be positioned on the mandatory cycle lane.