

Appendix 7

Assessment of benefits and disadvantages

Assessment of benefits

1. Cycleway 38 aimed to encourage more people to cycle, resulting in a safer, cleaner and healthier environment. These aims are supportive of the council's net zero carbon and Fairer Islington priorities. Table 1 highlights where there is clear evidence from the monitoring data and consultation results that the trial is meeting the scheme objectives.

Table 1 - Assessment of benefits

Policy	Scheme Objective	Evidence from monitoring data	Feedback from consultation
<p>Islington Transport Strategy Objective Two: Safe. To work with the Mayor of London to achieve "Vision Zero" by 2041, by eliminating all deaths and serious injuries on Islington's streets and reducing the number of minor traffic collisions on our streets.</p>	<p>Reduce collisions in line with Vision Zero objectives and encourage more people to cycle. Provision of a safer segregated space for people cycling should help reduce collisions and fear of road danger.</p>	<p>DfT collision data is usually released in June of the following year. Because of this delay we do not yet have any comparable collision statistics for C38.</p>	<p>In the consultation: Over half of participants (53%) responded that it feels safer to cycle, use an adapted cycle or a non-powered scooter.</p> <p>In the open text comments and correspondence received throughout the trial period, the most stated reason for supporting the scheme was because of the improved safety for people cycling that the scheme now provides.</p> <p>Support was also shown for the scheme due to improved child safety when cycling.</p> <p>People also commented that they support the scheme due to improved pedestrian safety and because of the need to reduce vehicle traffic and vehicle use.</p> <p>There was also a suggestion that the council now focuses on resolving speed and volume of traffic on Liverpool Road.</p>

Policy	Scheme Objective	Evidence from monitoring data	Feedback from consultation
<p>Islington Transport Strategy Objective One: Healthy. To encourage and enable residents to walk and cycle as a first choice for local travel.</p> <p>Vision 2030: Creating a Net Zero Carbon Islington by 2030 Priority 3: Reduce emissions in the borough from transport. We will reduce vehicular emissions by encouraging walking, cycling and public transportation.</p>	<p>Increase levels of walking and cycling.</p>	<p>On average across the route cycling has increased by 33%.</p> <p>All sites on C38 itself showed increases in cycling, with the highest being 96% on Tolpuddle Street.</p> <p>The greatest numerical increase along the route was an increase of 513 cycle trips per day, which was recorded just south of Barnsbury Street on Liverpool Road.</p> <p>On Liverpool Road south of Tolpuddle Street, a count location just to the south of the C38 route, there was a reduction in cycling volumes, with -16% between August/September 2020 and September 2021. This may be a result of people cycling changing route to follow C38 at this location.</p>	<p>In the consultation: Over half of participants (52%) stated it is easier for them to make the trips they need to make by walking and cycling. 45% stated they cycle, use an adapted cycle or non-powered scooter more.</p> <p>44% of respondents stated they cycle to local shops and businesses more.</p> <p>In the open text comments and correspondence received throughout the trial period, support was shown for the scheme due to the scheme encouraging / increasing the number of cycling journeys.</p> <p>Support was also shown due to improved accessibility (e.g. to facilities at Angel, across Islington, linking with other cycle routes).</p> <p>People also supported the scheme as it aligns with actions required to tackle climate change.</p> <p>People suggested that the non-segregated sections of the cycleways should become segregated and that the scheme should be extended (e.g. to Farringdon, to North of Islington) and/or linked with nearby cycleways.</p>

Assessment of disadvantages.

- The council committed to duly consider all feedback and objections received on the scheme and also monitor potential negative impacts of the scheme. In Table 2 the main criticisms of the scheme emerging from consultation, engagement and objections are put into context alongside the monitoring data gathered during the trial, and the objectives of the scheme.

Table 2 - Assessment of disadvantages

Consultation themes or potential negative impact	Monitoring report and summary of findings	Commentary
<p>Air quality & noise pollution The scheme reduces air quality / does not improve air quality.</p> <p>The scheme causes increased noise pollution.</p>	<p>Based on one air quality monitoring site on Liverpool Road at St. Mary Magdalene Academy, air pollution has remained below the annual objective average level of 40µg/m³ for nitrogen dioxide (NO₂). This broadly reflects borough-wide trends, suggesting that the Cycleway 38 trial has not had an adverse impact on air quality.</p>	<p>From the available data, it is not possible to conclusively attribute specific impacts of the Cycleway 38 scheme on air quality levels given that the trend is similar to the borough wide average. Post-implementation levels of NO₂ were generally below the levels of the comparable months up to February 2020, after which time the effect of the first national lockdown indicates a substantial impact.</p> <p>Noise pollution: Monitoring of traffic volumes have shown on average a negligible change in motor traffic volumes and traffic speeds along the route. Noise is measured in Decibels and with the most common metric used (the L_{Aeq} or equivalent continuous sound pressure level – it can be thought of as the average) it is typically considered that 3dB is the minimum difference that humans can perceive. For a 3dB increase in motor traffic noise along an existing road there would need to be a doubling in the number of vehicles. From this it can be assumed that the change in traffic noise for residents along the Cycleway is negligible. The volumes of cycling, a quiet form of transport, along the cycleway have increased significantly.</p>
<p>Pedestrian Safety The cycleway and removal of pedestrian crossings makes it</p>	<p>DfT collision data is usually released in June of the following year due to the amount of time it takes to process the information, so we do</p>	<p>In 2019, the council consulted on its draft Transport Strategy, which made the case for the introduction of measures aimed at enabling a reduction in motor traffic, enabling more people to walk, cycle and wheel and lead active lifestyles, reducing road danger and reducing the impact of transport on local air pollution and climate</p>

<p>difficult for pedestrians to cross the road.</p> <p>The scheme does not improve pedestrian safety / environment / pedestrian safety continues to be poor.</p>	<p>not yet have any comparable collision statistics for C38 as data for 2021 is not expected to be released before June this year.</p> <p>The council has not had any official reports of collisions between people cycling and people walking along the route though anecdotally some collisions have been reported but not confirmed.</p> <p>We take road danger reduction very seriously and feedback through the trial has raised concerns regarding pedestrian safety.</p>	<p>change. Because of the latter, it also forms part of the council's Vision 2030 (Net Zero Carbon) Strategy, which was consulted on in early 2020. Both of these strategies included policies and programmes to introduce a strategic network of cycleways borough-wide, and both were adopted by the council's Executive in November 2020.</p> <p>Pedestrian safety is very important to the council and is a priority when designing any scheme. As is standard for highway schemes, the design was subject to an independent Road Safety Audit prior to being implemented and once operational. Schemes are also reviewed internally by all the relevant departments within the council prior to implementation.</p> <p>We work closely with the emergency services before implementing our schemes and consult them at the end of the trial to help inform our decision and outcome of the trial.</p> <p>Because of the constraints of the road widths available at some points along Liverpool Road it was necessary to remove the existing pedestrian refuge islands from four zebra crossings and three traffic islands to accommodate the cycle lanes.</p> <p>The crossings meet regulation guidelines. However having listened to concerns raised around the removal of the pedestrian refuges at the zebra crossings on Liverpool Road, especially at the Cloudesley Square and Richmond Avenue zebra crossings, if the scheme is retained, engineering solutions and signage options will be explored and brought forward to improve these crossings where possible.</p>
<p>Safety for people cycling</p> <p>The scheme does not improve cyclist safety / cycle safety continues to be poor</p>	<p>DfT collision data is usually released in June of the following year due to the amount of time it takes to process the information, so we do not yet have any comparable collision statistics for C38 as data for 2021 is not expected to be released before June this year.</p>	<p>Safety for people cycling is very important to the council and is a priority when designing any scheme. As is standard for highway scheme, the design was subject to an independent Road Safety Audit prior to being implemented and once operational. Our schemes are also reviewed internally by all the relevant departments within the council prior to implementation.</p> <p>Where there are parking bays next to the cycle track it has been designed so that there is a 500mm space between the parking bay and the cycle track; whilst we</p>

	<p>We take road danger reduction very seriously and feedback through the trial has raised concerns regarding pedestrian safety.</p> <p>The council has not had any official reports of collisions between people cycling and people walking along the route though anecdotally some collisions have been reported but not confirmed.</p> <p>We take safety for people cycling very seriously and feedback through the trial has raised concerns around safety where there is the cycleway and floated parking and at some junctions.</p> <p>Monitoring has shown an increase in people cycling of 33%.</p>	<p>would have preferred a larger buffer zone, the 500mm achieved should nevertheless provide enough space for people to access their vehicles safely. All new cycling provision in London should conform to the Cycle Route Quality Criteria, which are based on the London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS). The relevant sections of the LCDS that deal with using parking as a separation between the main carriageway and a segregated cycle track are pages 23-24 of Chapter 4. This states that "Kerbed island separation or light segregation ... that provides a buffer zone of at least 0.5 metres between cyclists and parked cars is recommended in order to minimise risk of collision between cyclists and car doors."</p> <p>There are sections of advisory and unsegregated cycle lanes where business loading is permitted i.e. on Penton Street south of White Lion Street, the bay adjacent to the Business Design Centre and on Liverpool Road between Richmond Avenue and Barnsbury Street, which therefore provides a lower level of separation from traffic for people cycling at these locations than elsewhere on the cycle route. This may have a wider impact of preventing some people from using the cycle route; although scheme monitoring has shown an increase in people cycling along the route of 33% there could be additional suppressed demand.</p> <p>The junctions have been designed with the correct visibility splays to enable people cycling to be seen; however, after implementation the junctions of Liverpool Road and Barnsbury Park Road, and Liverpool Road and Lofting Road had parking bays suspended either side of the junction to improve inter-visibility between motor vehicles and people using the cycleway. If the scheme is retained, all the junctions will be reviewed in any future designs.</p> <p>The recent update of the Highway Code has reminded all road users that drivers of motor vehicles have to give way to people walking and cycling at junctions.</p>
<p>Access / changes to parking The scheme reduces accessibility and safety</p>	<p>We have received reports that some people who used the parking that was removed along Liverpool Road now have to park further away.</p>	<p>Islington's Inclusive Design SPD requires that there is parking or drop-off/pick-up points no more than 75 metres from the homes of disabled and vulnerable people. Distances between pick up/drop off and parking and homes vary along the route but the remaining parking and proximity of side roads along the route should ensure that</p>

<p>for older residents or disabled people and access for delivery / freight / refuse collection / taxis and private hire vehicles / health care workers.</p> <p>Concern that the scheme reduces access for emergency services.</p>	<p>Some older people, people with disabilities, pregnant women or women with very young children who used this parking may have been inconvenienced by these changes.</p>	<p>the policy requirement is met. This can be mitigated by providing allocated parking to disabled users if requested and the requirements are met.</p> <p>Along the length of this route the drop-off and pick up of passengers using taxis or private cars is possible from side roads or the nearest free parking space. Taxis can still pick up and drop off passengers on double yellow lines that do not have loading or waiting restrictions, taking care not to cause an obstruction or a safety hazard.</p> <p>Passengers requiring the deployment of wheelchair ramps can use side roads or the nearest free parking space.</p> <p>There have been some changes to where emergency service vehicles can access the kerb along the Cycleway 38 route in locations where traffic wands have been installed. For every stretch of 30 metres of traffic wands along the route there is a break of 8 metres to allow for emergency vehicle access to the kerb.</p>
<p>Parking and safety</p> <p>Concern that the floated parking situation is dangerous.</p> <p>Risk of collision between pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicles by floated parking, in the cycle lane, at crossings and junctions.</p> <p>People parking in the floated parking feel that because of the narrowing of the carriageway it is</p>	<p>DfT collision data is usually released in June of the following year due to the amount of time it takes to process the information, so we do not yet have any comparable collision statistics for C38 as data for 2021 is not expected to be released before June 2022.</p> <p>The council has not had any official reports of collisions between people cycling and people walking along the route or between people cycling and people driving though anecdotally some collisions have been reported.</p>	<p>The new section of floated parking adjacent to the stretch of high pavement on Liverpool Road between Tolpuddle Street and Richmond Avenue has created a negative impact for some residents wanting to use the parking bays. The combination of the cycle lane, the high pavement, the floated parking and the limited points of access to the parking, created by the high pavement, requires people to walk across and sometimes in the cycle lane to get to the floated parking spaces.</p> <p>The sections of floated parking have also created a potential risk of conflict between people cycling in the lanes and people parking, with a risk of being hit by opening of vehicle doors.</p> <p>A 500mm buffer zone between the parking and the cycle lane was incorporated into the trial scheme to allow people enough space to get in and out of cars without encroaching into the cycle lane, however both people walking and people cycling have reported feeling unsafe in this section, with the fear of a collision being the greatest concern. The buffer zone between cycle lane and the parking bay was not marked, and there is some evidence that some vehicles were parked over the buffer</p>

<p>difficult to get in and out of their vehicles</p>		<p>zone, reducing its effective width. To mitigate against this we recommend that engineering solutions to improve awareness of the buffer zone between the cycleway and the floated parking are developed and brought forward as a proposal should the scheme be made permanent. These solutions should draw people's attention to the buffer zone so that the space is left clear.</p> <p>The carriageway widths are built to regulation standards and have been subject to an independent road safety audit.</p>
<p>Scheme Design and safety The scheme is ill thought-out / not responding to the problems of the area / scheme objectives.</p> <p>Cyclists are still choosing other routes (i.e. Thornhill road).</p>	<p>Safety is very important to the council; the scheme was designed to regulation standards and reviewed internally across the relevant departments prior to its introduction as a trial scheme.</p> <p>The Road Safety Audit (RSA) is a mandatory process that is undertaken prior to and after implementation. Once the RSA has been written it is then reviewed internally before being sent back to the independent auditor who carried out the RSA.</p>	<p>In 2019, the council consulted on its draft Islington Transport Strategy, which made the case for the introduction of measures aimed at enabling a reduction in motor traffic, enabling more people to walk, cycle and wheel and lead active lifestyles, reducing road danger and reducing the impact of transport on local air pollution and climate change. Because of the latter, it also forms part of the council's Vision 2030 (Net Zero Carbon) Strategy, which was consulted on in early 2020. Both of these strategies included policies and programmes to introduce a strategic network of cycleways borough-wide, and both were adopted by the council's Executive in November 2020.</p> <p>As is standard for highway schemes, the design was subject to an independent Road Safety Audit prior to being implemented and once operational. Schemes are also reviewed internally by all the relevant departments within the council prior to implementation.</p> <p>It has been reported that vehicles are swerving around the speed humps and encroaching into the cycle lanes, it has also been reported that the proximity of the wands to junctions or entrances to drives are causing concern. If the scheme is retained the scheme design including the traffic calming and wand separation will be reviewed and improved where possible.</p>

		<p>The scheme, including the carriageway widths, were designed to regulation standards and reviewed by the emergency services. The emergency services did not object to the scheme being made permanent in the post-implementation consultation.</p> <p>One comment received during the consultation was that the aesthetic of the scheme is poor. The scheme has been designed with temporary materials and should the scheme be retained the council will consider the long-term use of materials to make Liverpool Road a cleaner, greener and healthier place to be.</p> <p>Islington and TfL assessed the route options for this section of Cycleway 38 as a north-south cycleway linking Farringdon and Finsbury Park. Although the route that includes Barnsbury Road, Thornhill Road and Sheringham Road is well-used by people cycling, along much of its length traffic volumes were found to be above the thresholds that are acceptable in design standards without physically separating cycles from traffic. On those roads it was considered that there was not space to provide segregation, whereas on Liverpool Road there was greater scope to do so. Liverpool Road is also a more closely parallel alignment to Holloway Road.</p> <p>12 month monitoring showed that cycling had increased by 33% along the route, indicating that the scheme has supported an increase in cycling in the area. Limited monitoring counts on Thornhill Road and Barnsbury Road indicated that this was not simply displacement from other nearby routes.</p>
<p>Increase in traffic, speeds and Heavy Goods Vehicles Concern that the scheme increases vehicle traffic vehicles speeds and the number of heavy goods</p>	<p>Along the route, average speeds have negligibly changed (+6.5% by February 2021 and -1.5% by September 2021), and 85th percentile speeds demonstrate very similar negligible change. The proportion of vehicles speeding does not show a significant change,</p>	<p>The observed number and proportion of vehicles recorded travelling above the posted speed limit both before and after implementation indicates a persistent issue with compliance by a significant minority of drivers in the area. Other measures may need to be considered in order to improve compliance with the posted speed limit.</p> <p>The council is committed to reducing unnecessary and inefficient goods vehicle trips in Islington and will be looking again at ways of introducing and enforcing effective</p>

<p>vehicles using Liverpool Road.</p> <p>Concern about speeding vehicles within the scheme.</p>	<p>although there are some significant changes at individual sites.</p> <p>Two sites along the route saw a significant increase in the proportion of vehicles speeding: Liverpool Road north of Barnsbury Street and Liverpool Road south of Barnsbury Street. Further monitoring may be required to understand why these particular locations have seen this rise, and whether these are related to short-term factors such as the temporary roadworks in the area at the time, or if they are part of a long-term trend.</p> <p>Liverpool Road saw a mixture of both increased and reduced volumes of vehicles speeding. Whilst average speed has dropped near Furlong Road and Cloudesley Square with over 1,700 fewer vehicles speeding over seven days, in contrast, near Barnsbury Street average speeds increased with over 1,500 more vehicles speeding at these points. This results in overall average speeds increasing on sites not on Cycleway 38, but decreasing at those on the Cycleway 38 route.</p> <p>The volume of LGVs has increased at all sites at the 12 months data</p>	<p>local lorry controls to protect residents and vulnerable road users from the negative impacts of goods vehicle through traffic.</p>
---	--	--

	<p>collection compared to the baseline. These increases vary from 2% to 90%, although the latter is from a low base of 55 LGVs per day at Madras Place. The largest observed increase was of 410 LGVs on Liverpool Road north of Barnsbury Street. The volume of HGVs has increased at all but two sites, Liverpool Road north of Barnsbury Street and Liverpool Road south of Barnsbury Street. Many of these percentage changes are large, although at all sites except Liverpool Road north of Barnsbury Street the baseline was fewer than 100 HGVs per day.</p>	
<p>Lack of consultation lack of consultation / undemocratic method for consultation (e.g. consultation won't be listened to).</p>	<p>Not monitored.</p>	<p>A common concern raised with regards to the Cycleway 38 trial was a lack of consultation before the implementation of the scheme. Government guidance from May 2020 stated that "Measures should be taken as swiftly as possible, and in any event within weeks, given the urgent need to change travel habits before the restart takes full effect." The provisions of the experimental traffic order (ETO) process do not require public consultation prior to the start of the trial, although the council did in fact engage with the public before implementing people-friendly streets schemes, including Cycleway 38. More details on the legal status of implementing the Cycleway can be found in Section 5 of the Delegated Decision Report on the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, and Section 6 on Legal Implications. Although there was no formal consultation prior to implementing the Cycleway as a trial, the council stated from the outset that the trial would be assessed by both monitoring and a full public consultation before the end of the 18-month period for the initial ETO. This consultation has now taken place and will feed into the decision-making process on</p>

		the future of C38 South. Data from the consultation process has been recorded and presented as an independent report provided at Appendix 5 of the Delegated Decision Report.
<p>Public consultation Concern that the questions included on the consultation are leading / biased / not the questions that should be asked and have not been widely communicated / public unaware of proposal.</p>	Not monitored.	<p>The public consultation on the making permanent of the scheme took place from 18 November – 15 December 2021. 4,500 consultation information leaflets were printed and sent out to addresses in the vicinity of the scheme within a 100m buffer zone of the route. Leaflets were also distributed during two outdoor engagement events and available outside one pre-booked indoor event. The consultation information was shared on social media platforms including Nextdoor, Twitter and Facebook.</p> <p>During the four-week consultation period, respondents were asked to provide their views on the scheme by completing an online questionnaire which also provided opportunities for free text responses. Paper copies of the questionnaire were made available at the in-person events, at the Town Hall reception area on Upper Street and could be requested by post or email. A dedicated email address was also set up to receive queries or other written responses to the consultation.</p> <p>Survey respondents were presented with a series of statements and asked to select if they thought these were occurring more or less since the trial began in September 2020 or if no change had occurred, or if the statement did not apply to them. There was also an open question text box where people could write down any comment on the scheme. All of these responses have been analysed and considered in this consultation report and will guide the council's decision on the future of the scheme. The council feel that this approach was fair and inclusive.</p> <p>The consultation received a good response rate, with 1,088 responses equating to a 24% response rate when compared to the number of flyers delivered.</p>
<p>Negative impact on local residents Concern that the scheme has a negative impact on</p>	Resident Impact Assessments (RIAs) were carried out in 2020 for each people-friendly streets scheme which identified potential negative impacts	An updated RIA (now Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA)) has been completed for the 2 March 2022 Delegated Decision report, finding that:

<p>local residents and their visitors (reduced quality of life, stress, anxiety, confusion, exacerbates poor mental health).</p>	<p>that the trials could have on people who have protected characteristics. These RIAs set out an initial plan to monitor the trials, and mitigate any negative impacts which were observed. A Resident Impact Assessment was carried out in August 2020 for the Cycleway 38 scheme which identified potential negative impacts that the trial could have on people who have protected characteristics.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The implementation of the southern section of the C38 cycle route has delivered positive impacts overall in terms of supporting public health, supporting improved air quality, and accommodating and enabling active travel. • The main beneficiaries of the response have been people cycling, due to the creation of cycle lanes protected from traffic. • However, the updated EqIA has identified negative impacts for Age, Disability and Pregnancy and Maternity groups due to the changes to vehicular access to the kerbside. • The removed pedestrian refuges from the zebra crossing and informal crossing points have made some users feel less safe whilst using them.
<p>Behaviour of cyclists people cycle dangerously / speed / aggressively when cycling.</p>	<p>Not monitored.</p>	<p>An increase of 33% in cycling volumes along the route is significant and would be noticeable to people using the streets in the area. All road users, including people cycling, should obey the Highway Code. Islington Council offers free cycle skills training for adults and children to enable people to cycle more confidently and safely on the road. The council has also previously run targeted 'stop and advise' sessions alongside local police officers, at locations where cycling contraventions have been reported.</p> <p>Many surveys show that the main barrier preventing people from cycling is the perception that sharing the road with motor vehicles is too dangerous, so by providing a safer space separated from motor vehicles people who would like to use a cycle as transport should be encouraged to do so.</p>
<p>Emergency services response times</p>	<p>No significant impact.</p>	<p>Comparing the 2019 average response time and the post-implementation period average, there was a slight increase in both the number of mobilisations and average attendance time for London Fire Brigade (LFB) vehicles. However, given the extent of variables that affect response times, the differences between the 2019 baseline, the 2020 pre-implementation period and the post-implementation period are within target times set out by the LFB and the council. As such, it is the view of the LFB and</p>

		<p>the council that the Cycleway 38 scheme has not impacted the emergency service's attendance times. The council will continue to monitor this indicator.</p> <p>There have also been no reported delays to the London Ambulance Service or the Metropolitan Police Service, each of whom provided a statement for the C38 monitoring report.</p>
--	--	--