

NON-KEY EXECUTIVE OFFICER REPORT

LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN	WARDS: Cantelowes, Camden Town with Primrose Hill, Hampstead Town, Haverstock, St Pancras and Somerstown, West Hampstead
REPORT TITLE Covid-19: Enabling Safer Travel in Camden – Cycle Permeability Programme 2020/21 phase 1 proposals	
REPORT OF Strategic Lead Transport Planning	
FOR SUBMISSION TO Director of Environment and Sustainability	DATE 4 th September 2020
SUMMARY OF REPORT <p>This report provides details of the Phase 1 proposals to improve cycle permeability at six locations in the borough, as set out in Section 2 of this Report, and for which a decision is sought. The proposals of ‘quick wins’ help to deliver the Council’s ‘Enabling Safer Travel in Camden’ COVID-19 response programme, approved by the Cabinet Member for a Sustainable Camden in May 2020 (SC/2020/74). Four of the six proposals require changes to traffic orders to amend existing waiting and loading provision and traffic restrictions: two are proposed to be implemented under permanent Traffic Management Orders (TMOs); the remaining two are proposed to proceed under Experimental Traffic Orders (ETOs) for a trial period, up to 18 months, in line with the approved process in the ‘Enabling Safer Travel in Camden’ report, during which time officers can monitor the schemes and feedback the public provide. This will then inform a later decision as to whether the proposals should be made permanent or not.</p> <p>Local Government Act 1972 – Access to Information The following document(s) has been used in the preparation of this report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• COVID-19 response: enabling safe travel in Camden (SC/2020/74)• Traffic Management Act 2004: network management in response to COVID-19 <p>Contact Officer: Jacqueline Saunders, Principal Transport Planner, 5th Floor, 5 Pancras Square, London, N1C 4AG, 020 7974 2765, Jacqueline.Saunders@camden.gov.uk</p>	
RECOMMENDATIONS <p>THAT the Director of Environment and Sustainability in consultation with the Cabinet Member for a Sustainable Camden, having considered the rationale and criteria for the proposals set out in this report in relation to the objectives set out in the report ‘COVID-19 response: enabling safe travel in Camden’, the Council’s powers and duties discussed in section 8 of this report (Legal section), subject to compliance with relevant statutory requirements approves the proposals set out in section 2 of this report, including the making and implementation of permanent and experimental traffic orders where appropriate.</p>	



Signed:

Sam Margolis, Strategic Lead Transport Planning

Date: 3rd September 2020

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 The proposals outlined in this report help to deliver the Council's urgent response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The pandemic has created new road safety challenges, particularly in the provision of sufficient and safe space for social distancing as lockdown eases and more people travel for work, study or leisure. On 9th May 2020 the UK Department for Transport (DfT) issued [statutory guidance](#) (last updated 23rd May) to all English traffic authorities directing them to rapidly transform their streets to enable social distancing, and make 'significant and swift changes to give more space to cyclists and pedestrians', so that people can avoid overcrowding on public transport where capacity has significantly reduced.
- 1.2 Similarly, in May 2020 the Mayor of London also issued [guidance](#) for his Streetspace for London programme to fast-track pedestrian and cycle schemes to enable more people to walk and cycle more often and avoid a sharp increase in car use. This programme will relieve pressure on the public transport network so that those who have no other choice can use it safely, and mitigate a potential surge in motor traffic which would increase road danger, cause gridlock and deteriorating air quality in the capital – itself a factor in the spread of Coronavirus.
- 1.3 The DfT's statutory guidance recommends different approaches to street design to deliver improvements for pedestrians and cyclists, such as installing modal filters (filtered permeability) and closing roads to motor traffic to reduce rat running and creating a more pleasant and safe environment to encourage people to walk and cycle.
- 1.4 In response, in May 2020, the Cabinet Member for a Sustainable Camden approved the Council's COVID-19 response programme of 'Enabling Safer Travel in Camden', which outlined a programme of work in line with DfT and Mayoral guidance and recommendations ([SC/2020/74](#)). The Phase 1 cycle permeability proposals set out in Section 2 below help to deliver this wider programme, specifically paragraph 1.20 (iii) of that report, to rapidly implement two-way cycling on one-way streets, if safe to do so, in line with the Council's Cycling Action Plan, and recommendation 2 of that report, to adopt a revised approach to consultation relating to Experimental Traffic Orders (ETOs).
- 1.5 The single member decision above also agreed that authority be delegated to the Director of Regeneration and Planning, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for a Sustainable Camden, to decide whether or not to implement any further traffic measures to respond to the safe travel and transport needs of people in Camden in light of Covid-19, subject to compliance with relevant statutory requirements.
- 1.6 The Cabinet Member for a Sustainable Camden subsequently agreed on 6th July 2020 ([SC/2020/84](#)) that the delegated authority previously given to the Director of Regeneration and Planning would now be given to the Director of Environment and Sustainability, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for a Sustainable Camden.

- 1.7 Camden has launched a “Commonplace” engagement platform, [“Making Travel Safer in Camden”](#), which enables stakeholders to make comments on and requests for wider pavements, cycle lanes, road closures, etc. It also allows people to agree with comments made by others. This platform generated requests for schemes similar to those being proposed for Camley Street and South End Road.
- 1.8 Section 2 below discusses in more detail the proposed Phase 1 cycle permeability programme, with a summary of comments and objections received to date from internal consultation and engagement with statutory consultees presented in Section 6.

2. Proposals and Reasons

- 2.1 The overarching aim of the Phase 1 cycle permeability programme is to help overcome barriers to cycling. Many streets in the borough are one-way and links between streets on desired routes and Camden’s existing cycle network are severed by infrastructure, traffic restrictions or highly trafficked major roads. The cycle permeability programme aims to make more Camden streets more accessible to cyclists and provide better connections and links through measures such as cycle contra-flow routes on one-way streets and cut-throughs at road closures. A number of such permeability improvements for cyclists have been made in recent years.
- 2.2 The proposed Covid-19 Phase 1 cycle permeability programme helps to deliver the Council’s approved Enabling Safer Travel COVID-19 response programme discussed in Section 1 (and here [SC/2020/74](#)), and the reasons discussed above and in that report, i.e. to deliver the DfT’s statutory guidance and the Mayor’s Streetspace Programme. These reasons/aims are: to rapidly transform streets to reallocate more space to, and create safer and better environments for, pedestrians and cyclists in order to provide sufficient safe space for social distancing, and safer and attractive alternatives to public transport and car use.
- 2.3 The proposals also align with the Council’s approved [Camden Transport Strategy](#) (CTS) and accompanying Cycle Action Plan. Measures outlined in Objective 1 of the CTS, which aims to transform Camden’s streets to enable an increase in walking and cycling, includes a policy (Policy 1b) to remove barriers to walking and cycling and improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists. Measure 1b of the CTS aims to implement infrastructure/streetscape proposals set out in the Cycling Action Plan which include cycle permeability measures.
- 2.4 The cycle permeability proposals discussed in this section involve a mixture of changes to existing waiting and loading provision, infrastructure, traffic restrictions and street layout. Scheme locations have been identified by officers as either in need of improvement to existing facilities, or of creating new facilities where feasible, based on the following criteria:
- Stakeholder engagement and requests: locations have been highlighted by stakeholder groups such as the Camden Cycling Campaign (CCC -

otherwise known as Camden Cyclists) and other community groups, as well as previous consultations;

- Links to key destinations, such as schools, hospitals, high streets, green spaces, essential services, as well as to Camden's existing cycle network;
- Deliverability and impact on other services: routes which can be implemented rapidly (quick wins), do not require costly modelling or infrastructure such as traffic signals, or significant changes to the streetscape or layout, and do not have undue impact on emergency services, and refuse collections.

2.5 Officers propose the following streets and wards for the Phase 1 cycle permeability programme:

- | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|
| • Camley Street | St Pancras and Somers Town |
| • Jeffreys Street | Camden Town with Primrose Hill |
| • Linstead Street | West Hampstead |
| • South End Road | Hampstead Town |
| • St Paul's Crescent | Cantelowes |
| • Wilkin Street | Haverstock |

2.6 In line with the approved 'Enabling Safer Travel in Camden' report [SC/2020/74](#), and for the reasons set out in Sections 2.8 to 2.35, it is proposed that two of the schemes are delivered using statutory Traffic Management Order (TMO) consultation, at Jeffreys Street and Wilkin Street. It is proposed that the schemes at St Paul's Crescent and Linstead Street are delivered under an ETO for a trial period of 18 months, during which time officers will monitor the schemes and residents and businesses can provide feedback. The proposal for Camley Street only requires a change to existing infrastructure and will not be subject to further consultation. Although the proposal at South End Green does not require a traffic order, officers will assess whether or not to make it permanent subject to ongoing monitoring.


2.7 To promote the schemes and encourage feedback to the TMOs and ETOs, advertisements will be placed in the local press, and notification letters with Camden Council contact details will be sent to all frontages in the vicinity of the proposals. Notices will also be put on the street and information provided on the web site. For the two relevant ETO schemes, the Council would like to carry out a full public consultation after approximately 12 months of the trials, and will take a decision as to whether it can do this nearer the time in light of the circumstances then prevailing. Monitoring data along with feedback received during the trial period, and the results of the public consultation (if it can be undertaken) will then inform the Council's decision as to whether or not the experimental changes should be made permanent.

2.8 Details of each proposal are discussed below, with detailed drawings provided as **Appendix A**.

Camley Street – St Pancras and Somers Town

- 2.9 Camley Street links King's Cross in the south with Agar Grove in the north. The street is a 'dead end' at the northern end which prevents the street being used as a rat run for motor traffic, while cyclists' access is maintained with a cut through on a raised path alongside the adjacent street. The cycle route avoids the alternatives on York Way to the east, which is heavily trafficked, and St Pancras Way to the west, which is similarly heavily trafficked and south-bound only south of Georgiana Street. The route provides connections for onward cycle journeys using an existing London Cycle Network (LCN) route through quiet streets in Canteloves to Tufnell Park and Holloway to the north, and through to King's Cross and St Pancras stations to the south via the Cycleway 6 alignment.
- 2.10 Guardrailing at both ends of the cycle cut through restricts access by larger bikes, such as cargo bikes/trikes, trailer bikes, adapted cycles, and mobility scooters. The proposals, highlighted by CCC as a quick win, seek to replace the existing guardrails at the southern end of the link with bollards. This will allow different types of bikes and users to access Agar Grove more easily from Camley Street (north bound) and vice versa (south bound). A request was made via the commonplace platform to address safety concerns through the prohibition of motor vehicles, specifically motorcycles. The request can be viewed here:
<https://camdensafetravel.commonplace.is/comments/5ec94cd7dff7474449669c7f>
- 2.11 It is proposed that the existing guardrail at the northern end remain in place to help slow cyclists and minimise potential conflict with pedestrians on the footway at Agar Grove, especially as sightlines are obscured due to the bridge parapet and boundary wall. There are also technical concerns: the barriers cannot be replaced with bollards at the northern end as the bridge deck is directly underneath the mastic surfacing. While officers acknowledge that changes are needed at the northern end of the link, this would require a separate scheme to investigate the junction of Agar Grove, Murray Street and the Camley Street link as a whole, along with full structural assessments. This is outside the scope of the Phase 1 cycle permeability 'quick win' approach.
- 2.12 The route also provides access to Elm Village, to the west: Elm Village suffers connectivity issues due to its location close to the canal, lack of public transport, and access streets. Camley Street is the main access route on the eastern side and the proposed upgrades will improve north and south cycle connectivity for these residents.
- 2.13 Removing the guardrailing and replacing them with bollards will not require a change to the existing traffic orders, and the proposals will not be subject to further consultation. The estimated cost of the scheme including amendments to street furniture, signage, notification letters (printing/distribution costs) is expected to be no more than £2,500 (see Section 7).
- 2.14 The proposals were subject to a stage 1 & 2 road safety audit (RSA) and no significant concerns were raised. A drawing of the proposal is provided as **Appendix A (i)**.

Proposed area for notification letters (within red line boundary)




Jeffreys Street – Camden Town with Primrose Hill

- 2.15 Jeffreys Street is a one-way eastbound street (with a contra-flow westbound cycle lane) between St Pancras Way and Royal College Street. All eastbound traffic, including cyclists, are currently signed to continue eastward at the junction with Royal College Street, with a 'no right turn' (southbound) restriction. However, this prevents cyclists from turning right, onto Royal College Street, to use the southbound contra-flow segregated cycle lane there.
- 2.16 Royal College Street is part of Cycleway 6 which provides a direct high quality north-south cycle route across a large part of the borough, between Kentish Town Road in the north and Tavistock Place, via Midland Road, in the south. Cycleway 6 continues further south on Farringdon Road to Elephant and Castle in south London. It therefore provides a key commuter route for people coming into and crossing Camden. It also links to other local cycle routes, particularly to the key east-west segregated route on Tavistock Place which connects to the West End and Central London, including new cycle routes on Gower Street and Tottenham Court Road. It also links to Holborn via the new public realm scheme on Brunswick Square. Exempting cyclists from the 'no right turn' from Jeffreys Street will therefore enable cyclists to access one of Camden's core, safe, high quality north-south cycle corridors on Royal College Street, serving multiple destinations and links across the whole borough and further afield.
- 2.17 It is proposed that this scheme is delivered under a permanent TMO to exempt cyclists from the existing right turn restriction, as there are no impacts on other road users or safety concerns. Notices will be placed in the press and on street, and notification letters will be sent to all frontages in the vicinity of the proposals. The estimated cost of the scheme including amendments to signage, notification letters (printing/distribution costs) and advertising the TMO is expected to be no more than £1,600 (see Section 7).

2.18 The proposals were subject to a stage 1 & 2 RSA and no significant concerns were raised. A stage 3 RSA will be carried out following implementation. A drawing of the proposal is provided as **Appendix A (ii)**.

Proposed area for TMO notification letters (within red line boundary)




Linstead Street – West Hampstead

2.19 Currently the northern end of Linstead Street is shut to traffic with a continuous footway on Netherwood Street, across the junction. The proposal is to provide a cycle gap to link the two streets, across the footway. This will provide a connection to Sheriff Road and to key centres and transport interchanges in Camden - eastwards to West End Lane and West Hampstead stations (and beyond), and westwards to Kilburn High Road and Brondesbury Station.

2.20 An ETO is required to remove existing parking provision of two resident permit holder bays/spaces to enable the cycle gap. The proposals were subject to a stage 1 & 2 RSA and no significant concerns were raised, and a stage 3 RSA will be undertaken after implementation. A drawing of the proposal is provided as **Appendix A (iii)**.

2.21 The estimated cost of the scheme including amendments to street furniture, signage, notification letters (printing/distribution costs) and advertising the ETO is expected to be no more than £7,000 (see Section 7).

Proposed area for ETO notification letters (within red line boundary)



South End Road – Hampstead Town

- 2.22 The section of South End Road being considered is a cul-de-sac, accessible at its junction with Downshire Hill at the northern end, and a closure at the southern end where it meets East Heath Road. The proposal is to provide a cycle gap through the road closure at the junction with East Heath Road.
- 2.23 A request was made via the commonplace platform to provide a cut through for cyclists where South End Road meets East Heat Road, which can be viewed here:
<https://camdensafetravel.commonplace.is/comments/5eedcb85ea71036cb92560d0>
- 2.24 Evidence shows that fear of traffic is the single biggest barrier to more people cycling – both volume and speed. East Heath Road is a busy road, and traffic speeds are high there. Average day time traffic flows are in the region of 10,000 vehicles a day which, for a street designated as a 'Minor Local Distributor Road' (according to the Council's road hierarchy), are on a par with some of Camden's busier streets such as London Distributor, Strategic Road Network (SRN) and even some parts of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN).
- 2.25 Annual speed monitoring indicates that average night time speeds (the speed used to assess compliance and the need for further interventions) are approximately 28 mph to 29 mph, with southbound vehicles reaching 30 mph. Day-time speeds are lower, but still exceed the borough's 20 mph speed limit at 26 mph to 28 mph, particularly on the southbound lane, despite a flashing Vehicle Activated Sign (VAS). There have also been nine collisions in the three year period to December 2019 on East Heath Road (the most recent data available). Five involved pedestrians, categorised as 'slight', and one 'slight' casualty for a cyclist. The scheme would enable cyclists to use the quieter and calmer section of South End Road as a useful connection to Downshire Hill and

Willow Road between the Hampstead Town and South End Green high street areas respectively, avoiding a narrow and busy section of East Heath Road.

- 2.26 It is proposed to include tactile paving to indicate the possible presence of cyclists to pedestrians, particularly those with impaired vision. The existing bollards would be retained. A cycle exemption plate would be added to the existing 'No Through Road' sign at the junction of South End Road and Downshire Hill. There are currently double yellow lines on both sides of the proposed gap; no changes to the existing waiting and loading restrictions are needed so a traffic order consultation is not required. However, officers will notify all frontages in the vicinity and monitor the scheme and feedback to assess whether it should be made permanent or not.
- 2.27 The proposals were subject to a stage 1 & 2 RSA and no significant concerns were raised, and a stage 3 RSA will be undertaken after implementation.
- 2.28 The estimated cost of the scheme including amendments to street furniture, signage, and notification letters (printing/distribution costs) is expected to be no more than £3,000 (see Section 7). A drawing of the proposal is provided as **Appendix A (iv)**.

Proposed area for notification letters (within red line boundary)




St Paul's Crescent – Cantelowes

- 2.29 St Paul's Crescent is a north-south route crossing Agar Grove. The southern end, south of Agar Grove, is a dead end; the northern section has a road closure at the junction with Agar Grove, covering the width of St Paul's Crescent, and approximately 30 metres along the street where there are several trees, and bollards where it rejoins the carriageway. There is a signalised crossing on Agar Grove itself with extensive guardrailing.
- 2.30 The proposal is to provide a cycle gap through the road closure on the northern section of St Paul's Crescent at the junction with Agar Grove, to enable a continuous route through Cantelowes, and remove the guardrailing to improve the street scene.

- 2.31 The scheme would require an ETO to convert single yellow lines to double yellow lines where the closure rejoins the carriageway on St Paul's Crescent. The estimated cost of the scheme including amendments to street furniture, signage, notification letters (printing/distribution costs) and advertising the ETO is expected to be no more than £6,000 (see Section 7).
- 2.32 The proposals were subject to a stage 1 & 2 RSA and no significant concerns were raised; a stage 3 RSA will be undertaken after implementation. A drawing of the proposal is provided as **Appendix A (v)**.

Proposed area for ETO notification letters (within red line boundary)




Wilkin Street – Haverstock

- 2.33 Wilkin Street runs east-west between Grafton Road and Talacre Road. Approximately half way along the street there is an existing fire gate across the carriageway which prevents through traffic, and the signage at Grafton Road and Talacre Road warns of a 'no through route'. A short and narrow cycle lane on the carriageway allows cyclists to by-pass the gate when it is closed. However, the gate appears to be damaged and is often left open: this not only undermines the objectives for having it there, it also presents a serious safety concern. When open, the gate can swing across the path of cyclists causing danger to cyclists, particularly at night when the gate may not be visible. Officers also note that there is a dropped kerb with tactile paving close to the gate where pedestrians are expected to cross the road, and could be hit by the gate.
- 2.34 In addition to replacing the fire gate with bollards, the proposal would require a TMO to convert single yellow lines to double yellow lines around the bollards and west to the junction with Talacre Road to prevent parking and ensure sufficient carriageway width for emergency service vehicles to pass through. A statutory TMO consultation will be undertaken, with advertisements in the press and on street notices and notification letters sent to frontages in the vicinity of

the gate. Additional signage will also be required at the junctions with Grafton Road and Talacre Road to exempt cyclists from the 'no through route' signs already in place. The estimated cost of the scheme including collapsible bollards, notification letters (printing/distribution costs), street furniture, signage and advertising of the TMO is expected to be no more than £6,000 (see Section 7).

- 2.35 The proposals were subject to a stage 1 & 2 road RSA and no significant concerns were raised. A stage 3 RSA will be undertaken after implementation. A drawing of the proposal is provided as **Appendix A (vi)**.

Proposed area for TMO notification letters (within red line boundary)



3. Options

- 3.1 Option 1 is to proceed with the proposals set out in section 2 above. This is recommended for the reasons set out in that section and in the Legal section (section 9) below, namely to meet DfT requirements for COVID-19 measures set out in its statutory guidance and the Council's approved Enabling Safer Travel in Camden COVID-19 response programme.
- 3.2 Option 2 is to 'do nothing'. Officers do not consider this to be an appropriate option as it would fail to provide facilities quickly enough to encourage cycling within the urgent timelines mandated by the DfT and the Mayor, which would likely result in an avoidably extended period of:
- Citizens being unable or less likely to choose cycling as an active and healthy alternative to public transport or motor vehicle use
 - Modal shift away from sustainable modes of travel – from public transport as capacity and willingness to use decreases, and active travel modes if facilities are not in place – towards private motor vehicle use

- Increase in private motor vehicle use, leading to increased congestion, more local pollution, and increased contribution to carbon dioxide emissions and the Climate Emergency.
 - Increased inequalities in respect of those in Camden who own cars – with car ownership levels in our least deprived areas being far higher than in the most deprived areas – having greater travel options than those without.
- 3.3 Do nothing’ also challenges the Council’s commitments in the approved CTS and Cycling Action Plan to introduce measures to overcome barriers to cycling, including cycle permeability to make Camden’s streets more accessible and improve connections.
- 4. What the Key Impacts and Risks of the Intended Options Are and How They Will Be Addressed?**
- 4.1 Officers consider that the proposals will help to overcome barriers to cycling, making more streets in the borough accessible to cyclists using different types of bikes, by improving links and connectivity.
- 4.2 Officers do not consider that the proposals in Section 2 will have significant negative impacts: two proposals require minor amendments to existing infrastructure where cycle permeability has already been provided, on Camley Street and Wilkin Street. Similarly, officers do not consider that the proposal for Jeffreys Street impacts negatively on any other road users, or raises safety concerns.
- 4.2 However, the proposed cycle gap schemes are potentially more challenging. The removal of parking opportunities on Linstead Street (resident parking on Netherwood Street), St Paul’s Crescent (overnight parking) and Wilkin Street (overnight parking) may be contested. Parking data for each location is discussed below. Officers are also aware from previous engagements and consultations of pedestrians’ concerns about cyclists’ shared use of the footway, and the potential for pedestrian/cyclist conflicts, particularly from people with a disability. These are also discussed below.

Table 4.1 Risks and Mitigations

Risk	Mitigation
The accelerated delivery of Safe Travel in Camden projects, without the full public consultation, may be considered unreasonable by stakeholders and the wider public.	This safer travel response to the Covid-19 emergency to be communicated to stakeholders alongside appropriate justification. Any measures requiring Experimental Traffic Orders to be subject to informal engagement with key stakeholders, including notification of works and reasons why, in advance of implementation. The statutory minimum consultation requirements (emergency services and road user groups) have been

	<p>carried out, see below.</p> <p>Where schemes are being implemented as ETOs, the trial itself functions as a consultation period during which time the public can provide feedback. In addition the Council will consider undertaking a full consultation when 12 months of each experimental scheme has elapsed, if circumstances permit. It is considered justified for the Council to depart from its previous consultation practice in respect of the implementation of Experimental Traffic Orders as set out in paragraphs 6.4 to 6.11 of (SC/2020/74) which has been approved by the Cabinet Member for a Sustainable Camden.</p>
Accelerating the delivery process results in compressing the normal technical project stages and may lead to oversight of key factors.	A Project Team, overseen by an experienced Project Board, has been set up to identify and resolve issues, provide governance and ensure the safe and effective delivery of each intervention.
Issues with designs of schemes become apparent after installation.	Stage 1 & 2 road safety audits have been undertaken for each scheme without any significant problems being identified. Stage 3 road safety audits will be completed post installation and any significant problems identified will be considered by the Project Team.
The proposal for Linstead Street would result in the loss of 2 resident permit holder bays/spaces on Netherwood Street. It would also prevent overnight parking on Linstead Street where single yellow lines would be replaced with double yellow lines.	Parking data for Netherwood Street indicates that the ratio of active permits to available permit holder parking spaces is 53% (63 active permits and space for 120 vehicles to be parked). Parking data for Linstead Street indicates that the ratio of active permits to available permit holder parking spaces for is 40% (10 active permits and space for 25 vehicles to be parked). Given the above data the impact on parking supply is not considered to be substantial, and repurposing of some parking to active travel modes may further enable mode shift away from private car use, in line with our CTS.
The proposal for St Paul's Crescent would not result in the loss of any resident permit holder bays/spaces. However, it would prevent	The proposal would not impact resident parking bay provision. It would however prevent overnight parking. Parking data for St Paul's Crescent indicates that the ratio of active permits to available permit

<p>overnight parking where single yellow lines would be replaced with double yellow lines.</p>	<p>holder parking spaces for is 43% (33 active permits and space for 77 vehicles to be parked). Given the above data the impact on parking supply is not considered to be substantial, and repurposing of some parking to active travel modes may further enable mode shift away from private car use.</p>
<p>The proposal for Wilkin Street would not result in the loss of any resident permit holder bays/spaces. However, it would prevent overnight parking where single yellow lines would be replaced with double yellow lines.</p>	<p>Parking data for Wilkin Street itself indicates that the ratio of active permits to available permit holder parking spaces is 269% (31 active permits and space for 15 vehicles to be parked). However, parking data for nearby Athlone Street, which is in the same Controlled Parking Zone, indicates that the ratio of active permits to available permit holder parking spaces is 16% (9 active permits and space for 55 vehicles to be parked). In addition, parking data for nearby Talacre Road shows there are 18 active permits and space for 58 vehicles to be parked. Given the above data the impact on parking supply is not considered to be substantial, and repurposing some parking space to active travel modes may further enable mode shift away from private car use.</p>
<p>Motor cyclists may ignore the traffic restrictions and use the cycle gaps, including riding on the footways at Linstead Street, Camley Street, South End Road and St Paul's Crescent, and ignore the new barrier (bollards) on Wilkin Street.</p>	<p>In order to access the cycle gaps, motor cyclists will need to drive across footways which may be a deterrent. Signage indicating that access is for cyclists only will be installed, and the existing 'no through route' signage will be maintained which will similarly help to deter motor cyclists. Officers will monitor incidents of motorcycle contravention, and consider further measures to deter this if necessary.</p>
<p>Increased conflict between pedestrians and cyclists may occur at those locations where gaps are provided across footways (Linstead Street, St Paul's Crescent and South End Road).</p>	<p>Officers do not consider this to be a significant risk as footfall is very low in the proposed locations: all are in highly residential areas and the risk is minimal.</p> <p>In the case of South End Road, there is the potential for conflict as cyclists exit onto the main East Heath Road. However, footfall here is very low. For pedestrians coming from South End Road, there is a safer section of footway which runs alongside the houses on that street and</p>

	<p>continues onto East Heath Road which pedestrians are more likely to be using. Nevertheless, tactile paving will be used on the footway to indicate to pedestrians that cyclists may be present, and a stage 3 RSA will be undertaken following implementation. Officers will continue to monitor this location.</p> <p>With regard to the shared area on St Paul's Crescent, this space is quite wide at just over 12 metres, with sufficient space to accommodate cyclists, pedestrians and wheelchair users. The width of the space should be sufficient for cyclists and pedestrians to have sufficient advance sightlines of each other approaching in both directions. The same applies to Linstead Street. Both locations will be subject to a stage 3 RSA. Officers will also continue to monitor these locations.</p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

4.3 The proposed measures are considered to advance equalities for many protected groups, albeit with a small disadvantage noted for those solely reliant on motor vehicles for transport. On balance, the schemes are considered to promote equality of opportunity among protected groups, in line with the Camden Transport Strategy. Equality considerations are discussed further in section 6 below and in **Appendix B**, Equalities Impact Assessment.

5. Timetable for Implementation and Next Steps

5.1 The next step for these schemes following decision report approval will be to proceed with the informal engagement outlined below. Construction of all schemes is scheduled to commence the week starting 21st September 2020. Schemes which do not require ETOs or TMO amendments will be prioritised (i.e. Camley Street and South End Road).

5.2 The experimental schemes (where relevant) will run for 18 months and the Council would like to carry out a full public consultation after each has run for 12 months. A decision as to whether a full public consultation can go ahead then will be made nearer the time in light of the circumstances then prevailing. If a public consultation is practicable, the response will, together with information from other sources (e.g. monitoring information), inform the Council's decision as to whether, at the end of the 18-month experiment, the changes should be made permanent. Traffic levels will also be monitored, as required, on relevant streets after the schemes are implemented.

6. Consultation/Engagement

- 6.1 The schemes discussed in this report have all been subject to statutory consultation with the emergency services, the Freight Transport Association and Road Haulage Association for a period of one week, 17 to 24 August 2020. No objections have been raised.
- 6.2 A response from the Counter Terrorism Security Adviser of the Metropolitan Police highlighted the current threat level from terrorism as 'substantial', and that vehicle borne threats (Vehicle As a Weapon - VAW), are often the first phase. During COVID, crowded streets, where people are queuing to enter premises are therefore very vulnerable, and they advise against removing street furniture (such as guardrailing) which can act as a protective barrier against VAWs. They therefore advise that the Council undertakes a Threat and Vulnerability Risk Assessment for each proposal to identify which threats are of concern.

Officers' response

- 6.3 Officers note the security concerns and the advice and guidance provided by the Security Adviser for traffic planning to address the threat of VAWs. However, officers do not consider that a risk assessment, as advised, is proportionate for the proposed measures and locations.
- 6.4 Firstly, all proposed locations are on very quiet, mainly residential streets, where footfall is very low. Officers therefore do not consider that implementing guardrailing or street furniture will contribute to a safer environment and mitigate risk.
- 6.5 Only three proposed locations recommend changes to existing street furniture: at Camley Street the proposal includes replacing guardrailing with bollards which will prevent vehicle access to the cycle link from Agar Grove as is currently the case. The second location, at St Paul's Crescent, recommends removing small sections of guardrailing around the signalised crossing on Agar Grove. Officers consider this will not increase the risk to VAWs. The rest of this long street remains unprotected by guardrail which means that this small section of guardrail removal will present no greater risk than already exists on the rest of the corridor. The current fire gate on Wilkin Street does not offer any security benefits as the gate is damaged and always left open; it also presents a significant danger of personal injury to vulnerable road users.
- 6.6 In addition to the statutory minimum consultation, the following engagement activities will be undertaken prior to implementation of each scheme:
- A notification letter informing local residents, businesses and local groups etc. of the schemes, the reasons for each, and opportunities to provide feedback and views will be sent to all properties in the area shown for each scheme above. In the case of the TMOs, officers will undertake consultation for the three week period before the schemes are implemented.

- The same letter will be sent to local stakeholders identified through the CINDEX database for each scheme area.
- On-street notices will be displayed in the vicinity of each scheme, and the Council’s Twitter feed will be used to notify all stakeholders of the initiatives.
- A dedicated webpage has been developed, within the Council’s [Making Travel Safer in Camden](#) Covid-19 pages, providing details of the schemes, opportunities for feedback, and so on.

6.7 The measures will principally be aimed at minimising road traffic collision risks to road users, in particular among pedestrians and cyclists during the Covid-19 crisis. In addition future measures will be aimed at enabling physical distancing, safe and sustainable journeys and reducing harmful impacts of motor traffic, thereby protecting public health and reducing inequality.

6.8 Negative impacts on protected groups are not anticipated for the cycle permeability programme, as detailed in the Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA) undertaken for the proposals and provided in **Appendix B**. The relevant decision-maker must carefully consider this assessment as applicable to the schemes they are asked to approve.

6.9 In addition, the CTS in 2019 was subject to a full EQIA and public consultation. Measures brought forward as part of this programme will either be included in the approved Strategy and/or consistent with the policies and principles set out in the Strategy. The EQIA on the CTS demonstrates that any potential impacts on protected groups are considered carefully during development of and prior to implementation of transport schemes. An EQIA has also been undertaken on the COVID-19 Enabling Safe Travel in Camden report.

7. Finance Comments of the Executive Director Corporate Services

7.1 The total cost of the proposed Phase 1 cycle permeability programme is estimated to be £26,100, £13,600 of which will be funded by Section 106 contributions for highways improvement works, with the remaining £12,500 to be funded by Camden Council Covid-19 transport programme “match funding”, as detailed below:

Scheme	Estimated cost	Funding source
Camley Street	£2,500	Council match funding
Jeffreys Street	£1,600	S106
Linstead Street	£7,000	Council match funding
South End Road	£3,000	Council match funding
St Paul’s Crescent	£6,000	S106
Wilkin Street	£6,000	S106

7.2 The Corporate Finance advisor for the Strategic Transport Group has been consulted and comments have been incorporated within the report, particularly this section of the report.

8. Legal Comments of the Borough Solicitor

8.1 The recommendations in this report are being considered in the Council's capacity as the Local Highway/Traffic Authority for the Borough.

Highways Act powers

8.2 Part V of the Highways Act 1980 (Improvement of highways) sets out various powers for local highway authorities to carry out works in or near public highways. The general power of improvement in section 62 is followed by a number of specific powers. It is considered that, since none of the specific powers is apt to cover the installation of a bollard or bollards in a street or road, as recommended for Camley Street and Wilkin Street in section 2 above, this work can be carried out under the section 62 general power of improvement.

8.3 Section 65 of the Highways Act 1980 (cycle tracks) empowers a local highway authority, in or by the side of a public highway, to construct a cycle track as part of the highway, and to alter or remove a cycle track constructed by them under this section.

8.4 Section 4 of the Cycle Tracks Act 1984 (provision of barriers in cycle tracks, etc.) empowers a highway authority to provide and maintain, in any cycle track constituting or comprised in a public highway, such barriers as they think necessary for the purpose of safeguarding persons using the cycle track; and, where a cycle track is adjacent to a public footpath or footway, provide and maintain such works as they think necessary for the purpose of separating, in the interests of safety, persons using the cycle track from those using the footpath or footway. The highway authority may alter or remove any works provided by them under section 4 of the 1984 Act.

8.5 The powers discussed in the preceding two paragraphs are relevant to the proposals discussed in this report for Camley Street and South End Road and for elements of the proposals for Linstead Street, St Paul's Crescent and Wilkin Street.

Road traffic powers

8.6 Parts I and II of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ("RTRA") empower the Council to regulate or restrict traffic on roads within the Borough by Traffic Regulation Order for a range of purposes.

8.7 RTRA section 9 (experimental orders), RTRA section 14 (temporary orders) and RTRA section 6 (orders similar to traffic regulation orders) are the main powers potentially available to the Council for its Covid-19 road traffic measures.

- 8.8 An ETO is appropriate for a measure introduced on an experimental basis with a view, if the experiment is successful, to continuing it after the experimental period has ended. Accordingly ETOs are recommended for 2 of the proposed schemes discussed in section 2 of this report (Linstead Street and St Paul's Crescent). A TMO is appropriate for a measure or scheme intended to be permanent at the outset, and the minor changes proposed for Jeffreys Street and Wilkin Street are of this character.

Statutory duties and powers relating to road safety

- 8.9 Under RTRA section 122(1), the Council has a duty, so far as practicable having regard to the matters set out in section 122(2), to exercise its functions under the RTRA to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. Based on case law applicable to another RTRA power, it is considered that "safe" in section 122(1) means "not at risk of accident", rather than "free from ill-health".
- 8.10 Section 39 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 requires the Council to prepare and carry out a programme of measures designed to promote road safety, to carry out studies into accidents arising out of the use of vehicles on roads in its area, and – in the light of those studies - to take such measures as appear to the Council to be appropriate to prevent such accidents, including giving advice and practical training to road users, the construction, improvement, maintenance or repair of roads for which they are responsible, and other measures taken in the exercise of its powers for controlling, protecting or assisting the movement of traffic on roads.

The network management duty and related Covid-19 statutory guidance

- 8.11 The Department for Transport (DfT) guidance referred to in paragraph 1.1 of this report was issued under section 18 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA). As the DfT notes in the guidance, "it applies to all highway authorities in England, who shall have regard to this guidance to deliver their network duty under the act. It is effective from the date of publication" – which was 9th May 2020.

- 8.12 TMA section 16 (the network management duty) provides as follows:

- "(1) It is the duty of a local traffic authority... ("the network management authority") to manage their road network with a view to achieving, so far as may be reasonably practicable having regard to their other obligations, policies and objectives, the following objectives –*
- (a) securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network; and*
 - (b) facilitating the expeditious movement of traffic on road networks for which another authority is the traffic authority.*
- (2) The action which the authority may take in performing that duty includes, in particular, any action which they consider will contribute to securing–*

- (a) *the more efficient use of their road network; or*
- (b) *the avoidance, elimination or reduction of road congestion or other disruption to the movement of traffic on their road network or a road network for which another authority is the traffic authority;*

and may involve the exercise of any power to regulate or co-ordinate the uses made of any road (or part of a road) in the road network (whether or not the power was conferred on them in their capacity as a traffic authority)."

8.13 The Transport for London guidance referred to in paragraph 1.2 above is issued under Part V of the Greater London Assembly Act 1999 (Transport), specifically section 144(2) (duties of London borough councils etc.) which empowers the Mayor to issue guidance to London borough councils, among other bodies and persons, about the implementation of the Mayor's transport strategy. Under section 144(3) the bodies and persons to whom such guidance is addressed are to have regard to the guidance in exercising any function.

Equality

8.14 The Council must, when carrying out the Council's functions (which includes making decisions), have due regard to section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (the Public Sector Equality Duty - PSED). This duty includes having due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic (including people with a disability) and persons who do not share it. The Council must consider the duty, which is personal to decision makers. In order to assist the Council to comply with section 149, an Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA) is attached as **Appendix B** to this report. The relevant decision-maker must carefully consider the EQIA as applicable to the scheme they are asked to approve.

8.15 The Council should also bear in mind relevant parts of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. Some of those parts relate to (as regards persons with disabilities) the physical environment, transportation, personal mobility and sporting and leisure activities (UNCRPD), and (as regards children) self-reliance and active participation in the community of disabled children, standards of health, dangers and risks of environmental pollution, and recreational and leisure activities (UNCRC).

8.16 In summary, the PSED requires the Council, when exercising its functions, to have 'due regard' to the need to:

1. Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act (which includes conduct prohibited under section 29);
2. Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who don't share it;

3. Foster good relations between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not (which involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to tackle prejudice and promote understanding).

8.17 Under the duty the relevant protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion, sex, and sexual orientation. In respect of the first aim only i.e. reducing discrimination, etc. The protected characteristic of marriage and civil partnership is also relevant.

8.18 In exercising its road traffic and highway powers, the Council is exercising a “public function”: Under section 29 of the Equality Act 2010, it must not, when exercising a public function, “do anything that constitutes discrimination, harassment or victimisation” (section 29(6)) and it must make reasonable adjustments (section 29(7)). The duty to make reasonable adjustments arises in relation to disabled persons and under section 20 of, and Schedule 2 to, the Equality Act 2010.

9. Environmental Implications

9.1 The proposals discussed in this report would result in positive benefits to the environment due to the potential for trips to be made by bike rather than by motor vehicle, thereby resulting in reduced emissions. This is one of the 7 objectives of the Council’s Clean Air Action Plan (CAAP) which states:

- Transport emissions account for approximately 50% of Camden’s NO2 and PM10 emissions. We need to encourage a shift to more sustainable forms of transport such as walking, cycling and ultra-low emission vehicles (such as electric).

9.2 The proposals would also result in positive benefits to the environment due to the potential for reduced carbon dioxide emissions. The Council’s Climate Action Plan (CAP) states:

- The Climate Action Plan necessitates a shift away from combustion engine vehicles and heating systems, both of which are significant contributors to air pollution in the Borough. The Climate Action Plan also seeks to encourage healthier travel options such as walking and cycling, which also bring public health benefits.

10. Appendices

- Appendix A (i-vi) Scheme design drawings
- Appendix B Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA)

REPORT ENDS