



TRANSPORT FOR LONDON

MINUTES OF KING'S CROSS TRAFFIC & PEDESTRIAN STUDY REVIEW OF COLIN BUCHANAN FINAL DRAFT REPORT – NOVEMBER 2008

Venue: Harding House

Date/Time: 2 December 2008 ~ 10.30am

Attendees:

David Braine	TfL RNM	(DB)
Helen Beaumont	Interchange	(HB)
Chris Maddocks	Interchange	(CM)
Caroline Wells	LRSU	(CW)
Nina Webster	Walking/DDA	(NW)
Edwin Basiime	DTO-UTC	(EB)
Julie Hassell	LRSU	(JH)
Richard Hartley	TLRN Planning Unit	(RH)
John Clark	CC	(JC)
Haydar Rukabi	Colin Buchanan	(HR)

	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>ACTION</u>
1.	Section 4.1 – Accident Analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It would have been useful to see some collision savings associated with the analysis carried out and the proposals put forward.• Safety Audit should be carried out on all the proposals and not just where recommended.• The report mentions that the street lighting may not be adequate but no recommendations to investigate or improve this.	HR Not in brief HR

2	<p>Section 4.3 Traffic Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The modelling seems to provide a good representation of the current conditions but TfL will need to be very careful taking decisions about taking out capacity at Pancras Road because there is some spare capacity now. The layouts are based on forecast future flows. When the Kent domestic services, LU Northern Ticket Hall and NR Western Concourse open there will be an increase in traffic, mainly taxis, both in and out of Pancras Road. When the King's Cross Central development begins to be occupied, and especially when the Boulevard opens, flows will increase again and will include around 30 buses per hour which do not currently use this road. This may account for the conclusion that traffic is slightly lighter than forecast, because 2008 is not the forecast year, the forecast flows assume the completion of the construction work (2020) Therefore, HR needs to amend modelling to allow for the above factors i.e. the 2020 traffic scenario. There may be an error in the assumptions regarding the proposed option for Pancras Road. If an e/b ahead filter is to be used the nearside lane should be a dedicated left-turn lane, but at present it is also used by ahead buses and taxis, and the model appears from Figure 6.6 still to keep this traffic in the nearside lane. If those e/b buses and taxis are forced into the offside lanes get away before the left-turners being held on red, there will be a reduction in eastbound capacity compared to the modelled assumptions. EB has used the observed flows surveyed by HR to update their base traffic model for the King's Cross area. They will not formally audit the Colin Buchanan (CB) modelling for Network Assurance purposes until final designs are funded and approved. It should be noted that CB have had the HR modelling work independently internally audited. The final report needs to include a copy of the VISSIM model on DVD. The current Mayor's Transport Strategy will be released in February 2009. Included in his priorities is the requirement for the degree of saturation for junctions on the TLRN not to exceed 85%. CB to note and comply when modelling proposals. <p>It should be noted that the brief did not require CB to carry out Road Safety Audits on options. Notwithstanding this, some of the following options will no doubt raise safety concerns at a later stage of assessment.</p> <p>Section 6.1 Options for Euston Road/York Way/Pentonville Road/Gray's Inn Road junction.</p> <p>Assumption in 6.1.5 is incorrect. This proposal has not been approved and is dependent on a successful planning application for a new development fronting Euston Road between Birkenhead Street and Crestfield Street. As of the time of writing no planning application has been submitted to Camden Council. CB needs to model all options for the current alignment. In addition the closure of Birkenhead Street is not a given and is likely to be opposed by Camden Council on adverse local access grounds. Although the brief did not specify Road Safety Audits the issues raised below are likely to figure strongly in any Audit Report. The drawings related to the text should show critical dimensions i.e. lane widths, sheep pen widths etc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option 1 Proposed set back of the east bound bus stop outside King's Cross Station likely to be impracticable in the short to medium term because of an existing electricity sub-station, which would obstruct exiting bus passengers. 	HR HR HR HR HR HR HR HR HR HR
3.		HR

	<p>The proposed method of control for the junction is potentially hazardous for pedestrians. To maintain capacity on the inner ring road the left turning traffic from Euston Road into York Way would be held to permit pedestrians to cross York Way, whilst the east bound ahead traffic would continue to run. There could be occasions where pedestrians wishing to cross Euston Road would see stopped left turning traffic and assume it is safe to cross on a "red man", being unaware that east bound traffic was still running. EB informed the meeting that at the very least DTO-TI would require a traffic island to segregate the left turning traffic from the ahead traffic. To accommodate this island it would be necessary to take away footway on the north side of Euston Road. This could require the costly diversion of services.</p> <p>In addition to the above issues, there is the possibility at peak times of the day that left turning traffic (storage restricted by the near side bus lane) may queue back into eastbound lane 2 thereby reducing the capacity for the predominant ahead traffic. Also buses proceeding ahead from the bus stop ay restrict left turning vehicles from entering the left turn lane.</p> <p>Task 8 of the brief required CB to model the benefits of the proposed additional west bound lane between Birkenhead Street and Crestfield Street compared with the current alignment. The report does not adequately describe the benefits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 2 <p>The assumption of low south bound flows for two-way working in the southern section of York Way needs to be more fully explained i.e., that most west bound traffic originating from York Way turns right into Goods Way. This assumption needs to be substantiated as one of Islington Councils principal objectives for two working was the removal of through traffic from Wharfdale Road.</p> <p>The comments for 6.1.5 and Option 1 above also apply to this option. In addition to the extra traffic island for left turning vehicles into York Way, the revised staggered crossing on the west arm of the junction would also require reduction in the footway on the north side of Euston Road with the corresponding impact on service diversions. The report does not address this issue.</p> <p>Currently, at the southern end of York Way on the east side there are well used loading bays. The two-way working proposal would necessitate their removal. Unfortunately, there are no obvious alternative locations for their replacement. Therefore, any statutory consultation on their removal is likely to attract objections from the affected businesses.</p> <p>The report does not provide details (modelling and layout) of the revised York Way/Wharfdale Road junction.</p>	HR HR HR HR HR HR HR
--	---	--

.4.	<p>Section 6.2 Option for Euston Road/Pancras Road junction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The comments for 6.1.5 and Option 1 above also apply to this option. For this particular option there is no footway space available for a traffic island to segregate the traffic turning left into Pancras Road from the ahead traffic. Similarly it is not practicable to set the east bound bus stop back outside St Pancras International Station as exiting bus passengers would be obstructed by essential guardrail and trees. <p>The left turn for large vehicles from Euston Road into Pancras Road is acute and swept paths for articulated vehicles and 15m coaches are required to prove this manoeuvre can be executed satisfactorily.</p> <p>Given the similar concerns for pedestrians crossing the west arm of the junction whilst left turning traffic is stopped and the impracticability of installing a traffic island, HR was asked to model reversing the stagger for the existing crossing arrangements at Pancras Road.</p>	HR HR HR
5.	<p>Section 6.3 Option for Euston Road/Midland Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns expressed about safety for pedestrians interacting with northbound cyclists. A Stage 1 Road Safety audit will address this issue. Currently, pedestrians cross Midland Road simultaneously with Euston Road east and west bound traffic. In order to maintain this facility, east bound cyclists would not be permitted to turn left into Midland Road. In reality, should this proposal proceed, there is the likelihood that some cyclists would ignore this prohibition and conflict with pedestrians crossing on a “green man”. <p>HR needs to show how the remainder of the contra-flow cycle lane proceeds to Brill Place and in particular its interface with the existing Puffin crossings on this link. Also an estimate of the number of cyclists likely to use the contra-flow is required,</p>	HR HR
6.	<p>Section 6.4 Option for Pentonville Road/Caledonian Road/King's Cross Bride junction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option was turned down by the meeting, (<i>CW & EB to provide comments</i>) 	

	<p>AOB</p> <p>DB/HR to agree dates for next iteration of report/options. Then second review meeting with TfL reps prior to full presentation to LBC/LBI. However, note that TfL TLRN planning unit meeting LBI/LBC next week to discuss their proposals for York Way. HR to assess LBI/LBC proposal.</p> <p>Note CB model may be used to assess Argents proposals for Copenhagen St and other traffic management measures.</p> <p>Note can TfL get some contribution to costs?</p> <p>IC Team to organise presentation by Argent on progress with KX Central.</p>	<p>DB/HR</p> <p>HR</p> <p>RH</p> <p>HB</p>
--	--	--