

## London Cycling Campaign in Hackney

### Monthly Meeting

Wednesday, 3<sup>rd</sup> February, 2016

### St Chad's, Haggerston

**Present:** Rachel Aldred, Anja Beinroth, Harry Fletcher-Wood (joint consultation co-ordinator, chair), Garmon ap Garth, Carol Gray, Dave Harris (treasurer), Bill Hodgson, Brian Jones, Rita Krishna (fundraising co-ordinator), Alix Kroeger, Richard Lufkin, Dave Lukes (joint web editor), Angus MacDonald, Trevor Parsons (joint web editor), Richard Patterson, Terry Patterson, Brenda Puech, Oliver Schick (secretary, minutes), Vincent Stops, Chas Wilshere (workshop representative).

**Apologies:** Jono Kenyon (co-ordinator), Siobhan Blackshaw (rides co-ordinator).

### Agenda:

1. Minutes and matters arising
2. London Fields modal filtering Film night and Q&A report
3. Gillett Square Cycling Festival
4. Hackney Cycling Survey
5. Web-site
6. Forum discussion (a platform for sharing consultations)
7. Burns Night report and finances
8. Current consultations
  - Mare Street between Andrews Road and Westgate Street
  - Seven Sisters Road
  - Lower Clapton Road/Urswick Road
9. Other events
10. Rides
11. Any other business

### Action Summary:

Item	Action	Who
February 2015: 3. Liaison with Waltham Forest Cycling Campaign	Organise a meeting.	Simon Munk, JK (taken over from TP)
June 2015: 2. Q&A session with Feryal Demirci, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods	Enquire about sharing traffic count data for Hackney Downs.	FD
June 2015: 2. Q&A session with Feryal Demirci, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods	Facilitate discussion of the Chatsworth Road scheme.	FD

<b>June 2015: 2. Q&amp;A session with Feryal Demirci, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods</b>	Provide more information on the 'ward ask' for Hoxton East and Shoreditch.	FD
<b>July 2015: 1. Minutes and matters arising: Q&amp;A session with Feryal Demirci, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods</b>	Enquire about progress with Lebon's Corner (Dalston ward ask).	OS
<b>July 2015: 3. Vision process</b>	Create discussion threads on the coming web forum, organise first meetings.	Committee
<b>July 2015: 14. Current consultations: Response to City and Hackney CCG</b>	Respond to C&H CCG's objection to CS1, discuss public health.	JK, RM
<b>August 2015: 5. 20mph</b>	Write to borough commander about 20mph enforcement.	DH
<b>August 2015: 5. 20mph</b>	Raise the issues at the next Safer Neighbourhoods borough-wide meeting.	JK
<b>August 2015: 5. 20mph</b>	Find out the likely cost of stickers and to do a design.	TP
<b>August 2015: 5. 20mph</b>	Ask Tom Kearney about speed limiters in buses.	JK
<b>November 2015: 4. Engineering list review</b>	Prepare presentations on Cyclescape and a forum for the December meeting.	HF-W, DL
<b>November 2015: Hackney members outreach</b>	Draw up a suggested schedule of Vision workshop dates.	OS
<b>November 2015: 6. Current consultations</b>	Draft a response on the Cricketfield Road/Pembury Road/Downs Park Road/Queensdown Road junction.	OS
<b>November 2015: 8. Children and vulnerable adults safeguarding policy</b>	Continue work on a draft Safeguarding Policy to put before a future meeting.	SH, RK, DL, possibly Ruth-Anna Macqueen
<b>December 2015: 1. Minutes and matters arising: Actions for Feryal Demirci</b>	Chase up Cllr Demirci about progress.	HF-W
<b>December 2015: 8. Hackney Survey</b>	Circulate suggestions for the survey and the draft survey.	RA

<b>December 2015: 9. Safeguarding policy</b>	Check with LCC office about their timescale for putting a policy together.	RK
<b>January 2016: 4. New group web-site</b>	Write an opening blog post about London Fields/modal filtering.	JK
	Draft a consultation response to London Fields.	HF-W, NG
	Ask DL to send the web-site live that week.	JK
<b>January 2016: 5. Forum</b>	Start implementing the process as soon as possible.	HF-W, NG
	Liaise with DL about putting consultations on the Forum.	HF-W
<b>3. Gillett Square Cycling Festival</b>	Co-ordinate organisation.	AB, BP, Ruth-Anna, RLu
<b>4. Hackney Cycling Survey</b>	Continue preparing the survey and to circulate it in a word-processable format.	RA
<b>9. Other events</b>	Convene an events planning session.	OS

HF-W took the chair.

## 1. Minutes and matters arising

TP said that the January minutes didn't reflect what he had said about the survey. He was going to send OS some text to add to the minutes.

OS said that he had lightly edited the minutes, written by RA and HF-W.

## 2. London Fields modal filtering Film night and Q&A report

We heard a report back from the previous evening's film night. There had been a high turnout of about 80 people. Some disruption occurred earlier, but it was not too bad. Negative questions were handled well, and it was less negative at the end than at the beginning. There were some reasonable objections raised. Many of them centred around why Richmond Road wasn't included in the scheme.

We discussed possible ways forward, including whether we should call for Richmond Road to be included in the scheme. We thought it was important to meet those against, especially those who had constructive things to say. Door-knocking on the week-ends was going to continue and was again going to focus on those households that had pronounced themselves in favour and might not have submitted their consultation response.

Key stakeholders that hadn't been engaged yet were the schools. We aimed to talk to governors and heads. Some of those against were trying to focus on key stakeholders who

may not fully understand what the scheme is about.

We also thought of proposing a meeting mediated by Hackney Unites, who were genuinely neutral, and discussed elements of a possible consultation response by the group.

### **3. Gillett Square Cycling Festival**

AB had recently started working in [Gillett Square](#). She said that 50% of Hackney Co-operative Developments employees were cyclists and wanted to do something on the square. We thought this was a great idea. It could be in Bike Week (11<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> June) or at some point close to it. OS said that we could continue the concept of the Hackney Cycling Showcase which we had run in previous years. TP said that the Council did pit stops for cyclists and we could suggest to them to hold one in Gillett Square. There was also the Dalston Children's Festival on the 4<sup>th</sup> June, which could perhaps include a contribution from us.

BP and RLu were interested in working with AB on this. HF-W suggested asking Ruth-Anna Macqueen whether she was interested, too.

**Action:** AB, BP, Ruth-Anna, and RLu to organise.

### **4. Hackney Cycling Survey**

RA gave a quick update on the Hackney Cycling Survey, which was running as part of a broader survey. There had been 1,700 responses on the LCC's general survey, which was going to closed once it got to 2,000 responses. She suggested that we could promote it through the local press.

OS suggested linking the survey with the draft Vision and inviting comments in this way. BH thought we could link it with a Mayoral election campaign and asked if the LCC was doing one. RA said yes, the Mayoral election campaign was called 'Sign for Cycling'. BH said his main question was whether we would like Mayoral people to respond to the survey results.

TP said that the main campaign was launching in March. BH said it would be good to be able to ask questions when confronted with the Mayoral candidates. RA thought this was a good point.

OS said he hadn't seen survey and asked for a non-online version to review it properly. RA said she would export the survey to a word-processable format to have it looked at.

TP said that he had just filled in the draft Hackney survey but there hadn't been an LCC survey attached to it. RA said that the LCC survey was a different one.

**Actions:** RA to continue preparing the survey and to circulate it in a word-processable format.

### **5. Web-site**

We heard that George Colouris and Alex Ingram had done work on embedding

CycleScape into other web-sites. We all thought this was a good development and potentially removed the question of whether to use Cyclescape or the Forum for discussions. When we had previously had the discussion on it, the option of embedding hadn't been implemented yet. OS said that he wanted us to have a unified communication resource and that he didn't want people to constantly have to move from one forum to another. TP said that the underfunded developers of Cyclescape had not yet been able to implement a good discussion interface, and that the value of using Cyclescape lay mainly in its geo-location functionality, which we would hopefully be able to embed.

## **6. Forum discussion (a platform for sharing consultations)**

RA said that one of the Cyclescape web-site developers, Nikolai Berkoff, could perhaps come to next meeting if we made a contribution to his costs, e.g. the train fare. She was in touch with him directly and could ask him.

TP asked whether it was possible to have restricted discussions on Cyclescape and whether there was any scope for integration between membership of our web-site and membership of Cyclescape. We thought that you could have restricted groups. HF-W said that he was still learning how to use Cyclescape, but agreed that restricted groups were important for our informal work with the Council.

OS said that we needed one forum and that using multiple ones was a dead end.

## **7. Burns Night report and finances**

DH reported on the recent need to settle an outstanding VAT bill relating to our Dunwich Dynamo work. This amounted to £2,037.80 and had substantially reduced our reserves, temporarily reducing our bank balance to £216. It had, in fact, only been made possible by the income from our successful Burns Night. He expressed disappointment that LCC had apparently been reluctant to enter into negotiations with HMRC, so that we paid the full amount. He stressed that, fortunately, our chosen charities remained beneficiaries of the work we had done.

He had therefore submitted a late claim for our 2015 annual LCC grant (£484), which in light of our former perception of our advantageous financial position we had decided to forgo.

DH also gave a financial review of Burns Night. This had 'ridden to the rescue'. While ticket receipts had been down by seven people (6%) and we had had more unwaged bookings, bar profits and other expenses had been similar, leading to a net reduction in profits of about £500 for an overall profit of about £2,000.

The final point was that there were some leftover items from Burns Night which would raise another £100 if all were sold.

All agreed that it had been a very good event, and the meeting recorded a vote of thanks to all the volunteers, including very notably those from Tower Hamlets Wheelers.

## **8. Current consultations**

HF-W said two of the following items had just been added on Cyclescape. RA said it was a good idea to test the new consultation process. TP stressed that it was important to discuss things at meetings. BH said he was worried about Cyclescape.

- **Mare Street between Andrews Road and Westgate Street**

OS said that this was a simple scheme mainly driven by the idea of unifying two bus stops.

BP said that it was Hackney policy not to have continuous footways, and asked whether we should call for continuous footways. Living Streets had asked about this and had been told that it was too expensive.

OS said that he wasn't in favour, because it was true that it was more expensive to use footway-like materials that could withstand vehicles being driven over them, and Hackney also didn't have a materials store where the necessary palette of materials could be kept, which was why they used very simple materials most of the time. He also said that especially along main streets it was important to avoid the effect of a visual and functional prioritisation of the main alignment over side street entrances, as this significantly influenced driver behaviour and de-emphasised local movement and corner interaction. While the effect of unfiltered 'continuous' footways was more subtle than that of modal filters installed at the main street junctions, it would still be noticeable.

HF-W said that in this stretch a third of casualties were cyclists, but most actions in the scheme focused on bus stops and bus accessibility. RA echoed this and said there should be more consideration of cyclists. OS said that there was no possibility of cycle-specifics there and that we should call for traffic lane reduction, but there was a need to treat the nodes first before treating the links. He added that even traffic lane reduction was very unlikely to happen.

VS said that he thought the aesthetic aspect of continuous footways was good, but worried about the higher cost. TP said that it was possible to get pigmented asphalt.

- **Seven Sisters Road**

TP said that we had first called for this wide street to be narrowed in 1999, and that it had formally been adopted as a proposal in 2003.

HF-W said that the consultation suggested six different possible 'aspects' that could be incorporated into the eventual design.

VS said that the funding came from the regeneration of the Woodberry Down estate. The idea was to have a tree-lined boulevard and to make the street look like a street that one should drive down at 20mph and not like a racetrack.

RA said she supported segregated cycle tracks, as it was a very busy road. RLU said that the speed limit was 30mph at the moment, and we wanted 20mph. BH also supported 20mph.

TP said that the street was an exception in width, having been widened when the estate was constructed. He reminded the meeting that junctions were much more important than

the links between them. It should be taken down to a standard width for a Hackney main street. He also pointed out our existing 'ward ask' of filtering Woodberry Grove between Seven Sisters Road and Green Lanes, which would have an impact on the junctions. There was a very poor scheme installed a few years ago in Green Lanes. To stop a series of crashes involving motorcyclists overtaking the queue in Green Lanes southbound being knocked off by rat-runners emerging from Woodberry Grove, a wide traffic island had been introduced that now also acted as a pinch point and a barrier for cyclists.

He also highlighted the problems at the Amhurst Park junction. This was a very large and wide junction, with the junction of Seven Sisters Road and Eade Road almost a part of it. This, too, had very wide radii and was hazardous for cyclists.

VS said that there would be drop-in sessions with the engineers that people should go to to learn more about the scheme.

We noted that the deadline was mid-March and would work on a consultation response to be discussed at the March meeting.

- **Lower Clapton Road/Urswick Road**

OS gave some history and context to the present scheme. We had worked on this junction for at least fifteen years, and he expected that past incarnations of the group had done so before. The proposal was for a 'pseudo-roundabout' with the approximate dimensions of a mini-roundabout, removing the existing traffic signals. The main reason for this treatment was because right-turning flows at this junction (from Lower Clapton Road into Lower Clapton Road) were very high and TfL had always had problems with queue lengths in Lower Clapton Road north of the junction and in Urswick Road. There had been a short-lived separate right-turn phase to prioritise buses as part of the Route 55 London Bus Priority Initiative in 2001, but this had soon been removed again, as it had led to very long queues in Urswick Road. This latest scheme was an attempt to solve the conflict between the different flows by making the layout much more flexible.

We noted that the consultation deadline was in mid-March.

BP said that the scheme was pointless if it didn't reduce through motor traffic. OS said that the scheme would actually increase through motor traffic. NG said she was disappointed and that the scheme was not conducive to inclusive cycling. She noted that a raised junction would have the advantage of lowering speeds.

DL said it looked nice, but asked why there was cycle parking in the centre of the carriageway. BH said the streets around should all be 20mph, and that he thought cycle parking in the middle of the street was good, as it would add activity.

TP said he thought it looked good and was an 'amazingly bold thing' to do. He said the point about 'inclusive cycling' was partly answered by the alignment of LCN+9 nearby. He said that at the moment it was a very unattractive junction, with unhappy filtering by cyclists, that would be better with a free-flowing set-up.

VS said he didn't know of another similar scheme and suggested that we should support it. He also noted that as part of the Route 38 Bus Priority project there was an existing

proposal to ban the right turn (from LCR into LCR) for private motor traffic altogether, but this had not been taken up.

RA said that her main concern was around pedestrians, and that replacing formal crossings with courtesy crossings was not a good step. Zebra crossings would give them higher priority.

OS explained briefly our historic concerns in the wider-area, which he had summarised in the draft 'Vision for Clapton'. These included achieving a crossing of Lower Clapton Road at Powerscroft Road, making Powerscroft fully two-way and running the 242 bus along it in both directions, making Median Road fully two-way and filtering it, as well as filtering Clarence Place. He said that he thought this present scheme proposal would make some of these impossible, as TfL would not install signals at the Powerscroft Road junction, which would be necessary for both a better crossing and for two-way operation along Powerscroft Road. He had long suggested that managing queues in Lower Clapton Road would work best if there were sets of signals at Urswick Road and Powerscroft Road and the problematic interaction with through motor traffic coming out of Median Road was avoided so close to the Urswick Road junction.

CG asked about the scheme at Poynton, which this one resembled. She thought that slowing down through motor traffic would encourage pedestrians to cross and drivers to look out for each other. NG said there was a real question here about the conflict between movement and place. She doubted that the proposed scheme would significantly enhance the place character of the junction, and that even a concrete table tennis table and a cycle maintenance place would not do this.

We agreed to discuss the scheme further on-line.

## **9. Other events**

RA announced a 'Cycling at Teatime' event at UCL. Yaron Hollander, formerly a modeller at TfL, would speak there. RA was going to e-mail the list with specifics.

DL and DH were trying to get a pub quiz team together for the Hackney Society pub quiz at the Round Chapel and invited members to join the team.

OS suggested holding a proper events planning session. He was keen to do a fuller programme of events this year so we could improve our outreach and recruit more members. RLu mentioned the De Beauvoir Festival held in De Beauvoir Square.

**Action:** OS to convene an events planning session.

## **10. Rides**

SB was going to be leading a ride the following Sunday (7<sup>th</sup> February) to the Kirkaldy Testing Museum.

TPt said she would be leading a Wheelers' 'Romance Ride' on Sunday the 28<sup>th</sup> of February, starting in Mile End Stadium.



## **11. Any other business**

**Membership:** TPt introduced herself as a recently-elected LCC Board member and said she had come because she was interested in membership and to think about whole strategies of how to engage new members. She wondered about what Hackney's ideas were about membership? As an example, when she had been elected, she had been cornered by people from Ealing, who had asked why nobody from LCC Central ever talked to them. OS said that it was easiest to engage local people at community festivals and that he would send her some information.

**Filtering:** RA said that the LCC's Policy Forum had discussed getting pedestrian and disabled groups to support filtering. They had decided to have an event to which they wanted to invite the Hackney Play Association and other groups.

The meeting closed at 9:20pm.

**Date of next meeting:** Wednesday, 2<sup>nd</sup> March, 2016, 7:30pm.