



NOTE RELATING TO COMMON GROUND BETWEEN ILHL AND CAMDEN

FOR PUBLIC INQUIRY COMMENCING ON 10th OCTOBER 2017

SUBJECT OF PUBLIC INQUIRY

The Camden (Torrington Place to Tavistock Place) (Prescribed Routes, Waiting and Loading Restrictions and Loading Places) Traffic Order [2017]

PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE:

DPI/X5210/17/8

CAMDEN REFERENCE:

SC/2017/04

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The purpose of this note is to record agreement between the Council and Imperial London Hotels Limited ('ILHL') in relation to geometry along the Corridor, flows of traffic, options considered, collisions, TfL's Pedestrian Comfort Level (PCL) and TfL's Cycling Level of Service (CLoS), as set out in the paragraphs below.
- 1.2 The Council and ILHL have agreed upon the following matters as set out in the paragraphs below:
- Geometry along the Corridor;
 - Flows of traffic;
 - Options considered;
 - Collisions;
 - TfL's Pedestrian Comfort Level (PCL); and
 - TfL's Cycling Level of Service (CLoS).

2. GEOMETRY ALONG THE CORRIDOR

The Council and Imperial London Hotels Limited (ILHL) agree on the measurements of the pre-Trial layout footways, cycle lanes and traffic lanes set out in Simi Shah's Proof of Evidence the Council understand these relate to paragraphs 1.6, 2.1, 2.2 and 2.8 of the same document.

Footway Widths

- 2.1 The Council and Imperial London Hotels Limited agree and acknowledge that the Trial layout provides the potential to improve facilities for pedestrians along the corridor. The same potential to widen the footway can be achieved in space terms whether the Trial operates westbound only for motor traffic or eastbound only for motor traffic.
- 2.2 ILHL and the Council agree on the design standards as set out in paragraph 2.9 of Simi Shah's proof.

- 2.3 It is also agreed that the existing footways along the Corridor, as detailed in paragraph 2.10 of Simi Shah's proof, are substandard and below the recommended widths set out in relevant standards.

Pre-Trial Cycle Lane Widths

- 2.4 With reference to paragraph 2.11 of Simi Shah's Proof of Evidence, ILHL and the Council agree that the cycle survey data from March 2015, collected before the implementation of the Trial, categorises cycle flow along the Corridor as 'medium flow' as per TfL guidelines (CD2/12) and agree that the pre-Trial bi-directional cycle track did not cater adequately for the numbers of cyclists using the route.
- 2.5 ILHL and the Council agree on the design standards as set out in paragraph 2.11 of Simi Shah's proof and agree that increasing the width of the cycle track will help to accommodate existing cycle volumes.
- 2.6 ILHL and the Council agree paragraph 2.12 in Simi Shah's Proof of Evidence, which sets out the counted number of eastbound and westbound cycle flows based on the specific day counts selected for the comparison of cycle survey data. ILHL and the Council agree that the pre-Trial bi-directional track, with high cycle flows in both directions gave rise to a risk of creating head-on collisions between cyclists.

Pre-Trial Traffic Lane Widths

- 2.7 It is agreed between ILHL and the Council that the carriageway lane width of 3.25m as set out in paragraph 2.14 of Simi Shah's Proof of Evidence is within the range of usual lane widths and would be suitable for the Trial and the Trial operating westbound only.
- 2.8 ILHL and Camden agree on the guidance used for fire vehicles referenced in paragraph 2.15 of Simi Shah's Proof of Evidence on the agreed understanding

that the Fire Service refers to 3.7m for minimum width of road between “kerb to kerb”, with 3.1m minimum width of gateways.

2.9 ILHL and the Council recognise and agree that in order to provide wider footways and cycle lanes along the Corridor, a reduction in the pre-Trial carriageway width along the Corridor was required as referred to in paragraph 2.16 of Simi Shah’s Proof of Evidence.

3. PEDESTRIAN AND TRAFFIC FLOWS ALONG THE CORRIDOR

3.1 ILHL and the Council agree that during the busiest hour for pedestrians along the Corridor the pedestrian flow is in excess of 2500 pedestrians per hour. This figure is referenced in Simi Shah’s Proof of Evidence paragraph 2.3.

3.2 ILHL and the Council agree that the eastbound and westbound directions of travel at Byng Place in the table under paragraph 2.6 of Simi Shah’s proof, have been set out in the wrong order and that eastbound and westbound traffic survey flows need to be switched. The revised table is included below and amendments are detailed in red. The numbers are derived from the counts undertaken on Tuesday 12th May 2015.

Road Name	Direction of travel	Morning Peak Hour	Evening Peak Hour	Daily (24hours)
Torrington Place (west of Huntley Street)	Westbound	349	322	5441
Byng Place (west of Torrington Square)	Eastbound	129	159	4862
Byng Place (west of Torrington Square)	Westbound	323	271	2323
Gordon Square (S) (west of Bedford Way)	Eastbound	232	224	3536
Gordon Square (S) (west of Bedford Way)	Westbound	541	469	7945

Tavistock Place (west of Herbrand Street)	Eastbound	206	262	3884
Tavistock Place (west of Herbrand Street)	Westbound	290	187	3748
Tavistock Place (east of Marchmont Street)	Eastbound	127	207	3163
Tavistock Place (east of Marchmont Street)	Westbound	245	155	3238

4 OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 ILHL agrees with the Council that the street geometry in the Corridor with the Trial cycleways in place does not enable two-way vehicular traffic along the Corridor.
- 4.2 ILHL and the Council agree that, from a geometrical perspective, to incorporate the Trial cycleways in the Corridor, it was necessary to remove a lane for motorised traffic.
- 4.3 ILHL and the Council agree that the pre-Trial traffic flow survey data showed more motor traffic on the westbound lane when compared with the eastbound lane along the Corridor.

5. ALL COLLISIONS

- 5.1 The Council and ILHL agree the table in paragraph 4.6 of Simi Shah's proof that sets out the number of collisions by all modes by severity along the Corridor.
- 5.2 ILHL and the Council agree that no serious and no fatal collisions have been recorded in the period surveyed during the Trial. The table in Simi Shah's paragraph 4.7 is agreed, namely, that the number of collisions involving pedestrians in the period surveyed during the Trial was two and that the number of collisions involving cyclists in the period surveyed during the Trial was 11.

- 5.3 ILHL and the Council agree that of the 10 'serious' collisions recorded in the three years prior to the implementation of the Trial (noted in Table 4.1 of Camden's Response Document), three of these collisions involved cyclists and that the majority of the remaining 'serious' collisions involved pedestrians.
- 5.4 ILHL and the Council acknowledge that Table 7.3 in the ILHL16 Proof of Evidence refers to the number of 'injuries' whereas the Council's Proofs of Evidence refer to the number of 'collisions'. ILHL and the Council agree that a collision could result in more than one injury and that this has resulted in the numbers provided by ILHL being greater than those given in evidence by the Council. ILHL and the Council agree the number and severity of collisions along the Corridor recorded prior to and during the Trial.
- 5.5 ILHL and the Council agree Tables 4.3 and 4.4 in the Council's 'Response Document.'

6. COLLISIONS INVOLVING PEDESTRIANS

- 6.1 ILHL agrees with the Council that, in general, one-way streets are safer for pedestrians.
- 6.2 ILHL and the Council agree Table 4.1 in the Council's 'Response Document' showing the average number of collisions involving pedestrians per year, prior to the implementation of the Trial, to be 7.
- 6.3 ILHL and the Council agree that the removal of two-way traffic along the length of the Corridor during the Trial may have been a factor in the reduction of pedestrian-vehicle collisions along the route.

7. COLLISIONS INVOLVING CYCLISTS

- 7.1 ILHL and the Council agree that in the period surveyed during the Trial, no collisions involving cyclists with other cyclists were recorded; a reduction when compared with the period surveyed prior to the implementation of the Trial. Both

ILHL and the Council agree that the removal of the bi-directional track and implementation of two, single cycle tracks should have increased safety for cyclists along the route and will most likely have increased the perception of safety for cyclists along the route.

8. TFL'S PEDESTRIAN COMFORT LEVEL (PCL)

8.1 ILHL and the Council agree on using TfL's guidance for the assessment of the Pedestrian Comfort Level of the Corridor, referenced in paragraph 4.18 of Simi Shah's Proof of Evidence.

8.2 ILHL and the Council agree the PCL assessment undertaken by the Council and the outputs of that exercise. It is agreed that at a number of locations the existing footways along the corridor 'fail' to provide an adequate level of Pedestrian 'Comfort.'

9. TFL'S CYCLING LEVEL OF SERVICE (CLoS)

9.1 ILHL and the Council agree on the appropriateness of using TfL's guidance for the assessment of the Cycling Level of Service of the Corridor. This is referenced in paragraph 2.13 of Simi Shah's Proof of Evidence.

9.2 ILHL and the Council agree that the implementation of the Trial layout has more than doubled the CLoS score of the Corridor when compared with the pre-Trial layout which has a score of 22.