From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: Junge Martin
Subject: RE: Mandeville Road, Northolt Preliminary Design Drawings
Date: 17 August 2022 10:50:04
Attachments: image001.png
image002.jpg

Hi, both.

This is where the published design guidance is unhelpful. There is a risk of drivers trying to pass cyclists where there isn't room, and it can happen to determined kerb-hugging cyclists in 3.3m – but it's unlikely where there are parked cars, and few drivers are trying to use it as a through route. Extra width is beneficial for passing cyclists in the opposite direction.

If we get a problem, we could deploy 'narrow lane – do not overtake cyclists' signs – but I would be very surprised if this was necessary.

4 metres is not enough width for drivers of large vehicles to overtake cyclists safely, especially in the presence of parked cars. The guidance is simply wrong on this. It is depressing how many unsafe schemes are going to be approved for as long as this guidance is not changed.

Some arithmetic.
Parked car to cyclist: 1m. Cyclist to nearside of overtaking motor vehicle: 1.5m. Width of even a narrow car these days: 2m. Total 4.5m – ignoring the width of the cyclist and any clearance the driver needs from anything on the offside. Even without parked cars, kerb to cyclist 0.5m, cyclist to nearside of MV 1.5m, minimum width of car 2m – total 4m – so might just be safe for a narrow car to pass in 4m, but nothing wider.

Best wishes

[redacted]

From: [redacted]@ealing.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 August 2022 15:11
To: [redacted]ealing.gov.uk>; [redacted]ealing.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Mandeville Road, Northolt Preliminary Design Drawings

FYI

From: [redacted]projectcentre.co.uk>
Sent: 15 August 2022 14:58
To: [redacted]projectcentre.co.uk>; [redacted]
<[redacted]ealing.gov.uk>
Cc: [redacted]@projectcentre.co.uk>
Subject: RE: Mandeville Road, Northolt Preliminary Design Drawings

Hi [redacted],

There are physical constraints in the service roads which could limit the widths that can be achieved. To

achieve a constant 4.0m there would be risks of the loss of existing trees, costly utility diversions, further reduction in parking and footway width narrowing. There have been successful contraflow cycling schemes implemented in other London Boroughs with similar lane widths to those we are proposing, although having said this, our proposals would be subject to review via the safety audit process.

Although the proposed widths are not ideal, the cyclist critical widths between 3.2m and 3.9m would be of greater concern in higher speed roads. In the service roads where the lengths are relatively short, vehicle speeds and flows are likely to be very low, with good visibility and with places where cyclists/ vehicles can wait: the designed widths should be adequate.

Best Regards

[redacted]
Senior Engineer
[redacted] projectcentre.co.uk

Project Centre, part of Marston Holdings
Phone: [redacted]
Mobile: +[redacted]
https://www.marstonholdings.co.uk/projectcentre

From: [redacted] ealing.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 August 2022 11:41
To: [redacted] projectcentre.co.uk>; [redacted]
<[redacted] projectcentre.co.uk>; [redacted]
<[redacted] projectcentre.co.uk>
Subject: FW: Mandeville Road, Northolt Preliminary Design Drawings

> Caution: This e-mail originates from outside MHL, exercise caution with any instructions in the content, attachments, or links.

Hi Team

Hope you had a nice weekend

Please could you provide a response to the query below which has been raised by Martin Junge in advance of our highways design panel meeting tomorrow morning?

- #2: Service road has an unsafe 3.3m lane width – lane widths between 3.2m and 3.9m must be avoided due to safety risks for overtaking or oncoming cyclists.
- Generally, is it possible to achieve a consistent carriageway width of 4m to safely accommodate cyclists on the service roads?

Best wishes,

[redacted]

From: [redacted] tfl.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 August 2022 17:42
To: [redacted] ealing.gov.uk>; [redacted] tfl.gov.uk>;
[redacted] tfl.gov.uk>

Cc: [redacted]@projectcentre.co.uk>; [redacted]
<[redacted]tfl.gov.uk>; [redacted]TfL.gov.uk>; [redacted]
[redacted]ealing.gov.uk>; [redacted]tfl.gov.uk>; [redacted]
<[redacted]tfl.gov.uk>; [redacted]ealing.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Mandeville Road, Northolt Preliminary Design Drawings

Hi [redacted]

Following up on our call last week, and as per my action at today's Technical Group meeting, I would like to give you initial feedback. As discussed, this is not a review by any means as I have not been able to involve the relevant colleagues but relied on my own experience and expertise – so there are caveats!

I saved the drawings you provided on the TfL LUF Sharepoint site here (if you don't have access please let me know).

Bus stops

Drawing #2

- Assets/ Buses would have to approve change of shelter type to back-to-kerb – it reduces usable cage length and kerbspace for buses by nearly a third as the first bus can't stop next to or beyond the shelter. Existing centre of footpath shelter allows for use of entire length of bus cage.
- This may introduce a risk of buses queuing and overhanging beyond the bus lane entry and into lane 1. As we have 5 bus routes on the corridor there is a chance of 3 buses stopping at any one time
- Suggest to maximise length of bus lane entry taper, eg parallel to central lane marking? (Would be exception to standard 1:10 / 30m length - a few line markings are still showing.)

Drawing #3

- Massive improvement! Removal of lay-by will benefit accessibility and bus journey times
- Shelter position and possible re-use to be confirmed by Assets/ Buses

Drawing #4

- Assets/ Buses would have to approve change of shelter type from back-to-kerb to back-of-footpath due to potential loss in advertising revenue.
- New arrangement appears sensible though as it will improve usable kerbspace.
- Is it possible to lengthen the bus cage to accommodate 3 buses? Aware there are constraints (eg HS2) and it would shorten green/ landscaping strip.

Ped crossings

- Relocation reflects previous discussion, ie aim to connect green spaces (as per design decision)
- Caveat: timescales. Typical signal scheme duration will take us beyond March '24 hence need to confirm with DfT and TfL Signals.
- Design will need to adhere to TfL 'gold standard' – TfL Signals would cover this in the design process.

Pedestrians

- Should we take raised tables further and consider continuous footways to provide pedestrian priority at side roads, if safe? Note recent DfT change to Highway Code with new road user hierarchy and ped priority at junctions. I think it would be good to discuss for consistency on the entire Church Rd corridor (Ealing and TLRN).

- #1, #4: Church Avenue and Sainsbury's access do not feature raised tables - why not?

Cycling

- #2: Service road has an unsafe 3.3m lane width – lane widths between 3.2m and 3.9m must be avoided due to safety risks for overtaking or oncoming cyclists.
- Generally, is it possible to achieve a consistent carriageway width of 4m to safely accommodate cyclists on the service roads? Placement of parking bays needs to be considered carefully, including possible safety zones in case of 'dooring'.
- #2: short facility between service road and Alderney Gardens seems somewhat misaligned – suggest to align more directly with northern service road (and possibly new tree if it can be provided without impacting sightlines for left turners on to Church Rd)

So these are my very own comments, but I hope they are useful for now. I would say no showstoppers, but definitely need confirmation from Assets, Buses, Signals and a Road Safety Audit.

Best regards,
Martin

Martin Junge
Principal Sponsor (Ealing) | TfL IDP Network Sponsorship
P: [redacted]

From: Junge Martin
Sent: 04 August 2022 17:44
To: [redacted] ealing.gov.uk>; [redacted] tfl.gov.uk>; [redacted] tfl.gov.uk>
Cc: [redacted] projectcentre.co.uk>; [redacted] tfl.gov.uk>; [redacted] TfL.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Mandeville Road, Northolt Preliminary Design Drawings

Hi [redacted]

I was just getting back to [redacted] before logging off – that is a very short deadline.

Not sure if any of my Sponsor colleagues can pick this up. As [redacted], we may not be able to involve stakeholders before next week.

[redacted] so can't be involved before the Design Panel meeting. Darren Berry covers for her but I don't know how familiar he is with site and proposals. [redacted] fl.gov.uk [redacted])

I think the only possible option would be for [redacted] to contact TfL stakeholders directly as per the plan I shared with him. Gareth may be able to assist with the Sharepoint upload.

There were always going to be seasonal difficulties, but less than 5 working days would be challenging for us at the best of times, I'm afraid.

Many thanks,
Martin

Martin Junge
Principal Sponsor (Ealing) | TfL IDP Network Sponsorship
P: [redacted]

From: [redacted] ealing.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 August 2022 17:23

To: [redacted] tfl.gov.uk>; [redacted] tfl.gov.uk>; [redacted] tfl.gov.uk>
Cc: [redacted] projectcentre.co.uk>; [redacted] tfl.gov.uk>; [redacted] TfL.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Mandeville Road, Northolt Preliminary Design Drawings

Hi Martin

Copying in the other TfL Sponsors who may be able to help coordinate an initial response [redacted] Specific feedback on the draft proposals in relation to bus stops / crossings would be useful at this stage. There will also be more opportunities for feedback during the concept design consultation phase in Sept/October.

Following our internal design panel I will be issuing the designs to Active Travel England to review w/c 15th August so would be good to have some comments back before then.

As [redacted] suggested below, we are happy to meet on site with bus colleagues to understand any operational issues, similar to WELN.

Kind regards,

[redacted]

From: [redacted] projectcentre.co.uk>
Sent: 04 August 2022 16:29
To: [redacted] tfl.gov.uk>
Cc: [redacted] tfl.gov.uk>; [redacted] tfl.gov.uk; [redacted] <[redacted] projectcentre.co.uk>; [redacted] ealing.gov.uk>; [redacted] <[redacted] projectcentre.co.uk>
Subject: Mandeville Road, Northolt Preliminary Design Drawings

Hi Martin

Please see attached Mandeville Road Preliminary Design layout drawings for TfL comments. Specifically comments on bus stops would be welcome [redacted] Could we have your early comments back by Wednesday 10th as we need to issue the drawings back to Ealing by Friday the 12th of August for their Design Panel.

I would also like to meet with [redacted] or her team) to take her through the designs for the bus stops. We are happy to meet them on site to discuss.. I am happy to upload the drawings and documents into the TfL website.

Regards

[redacted]

Project Centre, part of Marston Holdings
Mobile [redacted]

Phone: +[redacted]
https://www.marstonholdings.co.uk/projectcentre

****

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

The content of this email and any attachment transmitted within are confidential and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this email in error, please notify the sender and delete this message along with any attachments immediately. Unauthorised usage, disclosure, copying or forwarding of this email, its content and/or any attachments is strictly forbidden.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept by Mimecast for the presence of computer viruses.

www.mimecast.com

****

This message has been scanned for malware by Forcepoint. www.forcepoint.com