

London Cycling Campaign in Hackney

Monthly Meeting

Wednesday, 2nd March, 2016

St Chad's, Haggerston

Present: Rachel Aldred, Nikolai Berkoff (Cyclescape), Siobhan Blackshaw (rides co-ordinator), John Campbell, Jasmina Cenan, George Coulouris, Stuart Dennison, Stewart Dring, Marian Farrugia, Garmon ap Garth, Natalie Gould (joint consultation co-ordinator), Carol Gray, Dave Harris (treasurer), Harry Hewat, Jono Kenyon (co-ordinator), Rita Krishna (fundraising co-ordinator), Laura Laker, Dave Lukes (joint web-site editor), Angus Macdonald, Ruth-Anna Macqueen (community outreach co-ordinator), David Moreno, Simon Munk, Brenda Puech (events co-ordinator), Matt Saywell, Oliver Schick (secretary), Alix Stredwick, David Vellala, James Woodcock.

Apologies: Tim Evans, Trevor Parsons (joint web editor), Adrian Weidmann.

Agenda:

1. Minutes and matters arising
2. Nikolai Berkoff on Cyclescape
3. 'Sign for Cycling', the LCC's 2016 Mayoral and London Assembly election campaign
4. London Fields modal filtering
5. Hackney Cycling Survey
6. Web-site
7. Finance
 - 2016 Burns Night 'wash-up'
 - Dunwich Dynamo 2016 consideration and review of risk analysis
 - HCC financials: 2015-16 outturn and 2016-17 budget before submission to LCC
8. Garage
9. Hackney Bike Workshop (Clapton branch)
10. Current consultations
 - Seven Sisters Road
 - Lower Clapton Road/Urswick Road
11. Ride Leader Training in February
12. Rides
13. 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	Enquire about sharing traffic	FD

with Feryal Demirci, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods	count data for Hackney Downs.	
June 2015: 2. Q&A session with Feryal Demirci, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods	Facilitate discussion of the Chatsworth Road scheme.	FD
June 2015: 2. Q&A session with Feryal Demirci, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods	Provide more information on the 'ward ask' for Hoxton East and Shoreditch.	FD
July 2015: 1. Minutes and matters arising: Q&A session with Feryal Demirci, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods	Enquire about progress with Lebon's Corner (Dalston ward ask).	OS
July 2015: 3. Vision process	Create discussion threads on the coming web forum, organise first meetings.	Committee
July 2015: 14. Current consultations: Response to City and Hackney CCG	Respond to C&H CCG's objection to CS1, discuss public health.	JK, RM
August 2015: 5. 20mph	Write to borough commander about 20mph enforcement.	DH
August 2015: 5. 20mph	Raise the issues at the next Safer Neighbourhoods borough-wide meeting.	JK
August 2015: 5. 20mph	Find out the likely cost of stickers and to do a design.	TP
August 2015: 5. 20mph	Ask Tom Kearney about speed limiters in buses.	JK
November 2015: 4. Engineering list review	Prepare presentations on Cyclescape and a forum for the December meeting.	HF-W, DL
November 2015: Hackney members outreach	Draw up a suggested schedule of Vision workshop dates.	OS
November 2015: 6. Current consultations	Draft a response on the Cricketfield Road/Pembury Road/Downs Park Road/Queensdown Road junction.	OS
December 2015: 1. Minutes and matters arising:	Chase up Cllr Demirci about progress.	HF-W

Actions for Feryal Demirci		
January 2016: 4. New group web-site	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
January 2016: 5. Forum	Start implementing the process as soon as possible.	HF-W, NG
	Liaise with DL about putting consultations on the Forum.	HF-W
February 2016: 3. Gillett Square Cycling Festival	Co-ordinate organisation.	AB, BP, RM, RLu
February 2016: 4. Hackney Cycling Survey	Continue preparing the survey and to circulate it in a word-processable format.	RA
February 2016: 9. Other events	Convene an events planning session.	OS
8. Garage	Audit the garage and make recommendations to the group.	BP, OS, DL.

1. Minutes and matters arising

Safeguarding policy: RK had spoken to SDr about the LCC office's work in drawing up a policy. It was not possible to circulate the draft yet, whereas e-mail discussions were ongoing.

Events: OS hadn't done events planning yet.

2. Nikolai Berkoff on Cyclescape

The meeting welcomed NB, who was a developer on this project, initiated by Cambridge Cycling Campaign. It had been used by Cambridge for some years. He took us through the functionality of the site, including the facility to participate in discussions via e-mail. He said that there were still some useability issues but the developers were working on those based on user feedback.

It was a very location-based system. For instance, it was possible to see planning applications within a certain distance of a point on the map. There was also the possibility of filtering out irrelevant planning applications, e.g. the many applications Cambridge Council put up there for tree-cutting. The system was based on 'issues', which users put up, and related threads, in which these issues were described.

NG asked if Cyclescape facilitated setting up Doodle polls to invite all participants in a

given Cyclescape thread. NB said that it wasn't possible to 'force' e-mails on a given group of people. GC said that the Camden group did polls like this all the time, but just sent them to their main list, rather than just limiting them to Cyclescape participants.

HH asked about using Ordnance Survey mapping, which he said was essential for being able to consider a location in detail. It was also what engineers based scheme drawings on. There was a free Ordnance Survey layer on OpenStreetMap. OS said HH and he had looked into this, as part of illustrating the draft Vision, but that it was probably too far away, as Ordnance Survey charged for use of their base mapping layer. NB agreed and said that the free 1:10,000 layer was something the Government had forced Ordnance Survey to offer, but that unless cycle campaigning groups paid for use of their main mapping, it would not happen. GC said it was not available.

DL asked about the mechanism for GPS-based detection of cycling-related things close to where one cycled. He had recently cycled close to Blackfriars Station but hadn't been told of the Cycle Superhighway there. NB said that it might not have been put up there as an issue. DL said that someone had put something on there, but it hadn't appeared. NB said that things within 15m of where people are riding should appear. DL asked if the detection was 'fuzzy' or precise. NB said it wouldn't trawl everything that had happened in the past. DL asked if there was a possibility for users to set their own detection limits. NB said that Cyclescape were not inclined to open this sort of option up to users, as they would not be able to use it. However, he said that they wanted to make things that work for cycle campaigners, and if DL thought this was necessary, they should have an option for him.

GC had developed a Cyclescape Issue Map. This was an independent piece of software which could be integrated anywhere on any web-site. It had been [up on the LCC web-site](#) for a month and was a map which interfaced with the Cyclescape service, acquiring data in a given geographical area of all the issues on there. He said that there was the possibility of this mechanism failing occasionally, owing to the nature of distributed computing ('distributed computing is something in which a computer you've never heard of can stop you getting your work done'), in case Cyclescape and the Issues Map stopped talking to each other.

GC demonstrated the functionality of the Issues Map. There were two steps to carry out, first to go to the issue page, and then to the discussion thread for the respective items. GC was not putting up all possible issues, as there were far too many if one included very small schemes. Boroughs were also selectable, and issues could be tagged in several ways. NB was implementing an Application Programming Interface (API) in getting the data from Cyclescape.

SM said he had been entering incoming consultations on Cyclescape. There were currently many consultations going through before the Mayoral elections, so that the office was overwhelmed with them.

MF said she worked for a Council which had a consultation hub and asked whether Cyclescape 'spoke' to such borough web-sites. She also said that a lot of consultations relevant to cycling didn't have 'cycling' in the title. NB said that the Cyclescape developers had pulled in all the planning applications, so that there was no reason why consultations couldn't be pulled in. OS said this was still some way in the future, as Council web-sites were very inconsistent. It had been easier for planning applications, as there was a single

unified quasi-judicial process for them. DL said that he could build something to scrape Hackney's web-site. OS said it was unlikely for that to be possible yet given the state of the site.

OS asked about 'forum-hopping'. He said that he thought the main problem with using Cyclescape was forcing users to use two forums when all of the group's communication channels should be on one forum, which we had decided to move to. For instance, the group's work apart from consultations and its social life would also be there, and separating the two would make it more difficult for the group to function. NB said that there were 'administrative threads' which could be used for other kinds of activity. GC said that the Cambridge group used Cyclescape as their group forum and had all of their discussions on there. OS said that we had our own web-site and using Cyclescape would necessarily cause duplication.

The meeting thanked NB for coming.

3. 'Sign for Cycling', the LCC's 2016 Mayoral and London Assembly election campaign

SDr introduced the new campaign. It was going to go 'live' on the Monday or Tuesday following the meeting. There were three asks: one on lorries, one about 'Mini-Hollands', and one about segregated cycle tracks on main streets. The LCC was trying to get more petition signatures than for the previous Mayoral election campaign. The aim was for 60,000 signatures, and there was flyering going on all over London to achieve this. SDr distributed some publicity materials to the meeting.

4. London Fields modal filtering

We heard updates on activity to support the scheme. There were about four weeks to go in the consultation. Supporters were still carrying out old-fashioned door-knocking and handing out flyers and called for the on-line consultation to be done by LCCiH members.

A conciliatory meeting had been proposed with opponents of the scheme. There were discussions ongoing how to set this up and who would facilitate. JK said that he had offered to meet to every opponent who contacted him on Twitter, but no-one had taken him up on this.

There was a new demand to 'divert' the 'Quietway' along Albion Drive, but we thought this was not possible, and that it appeared, at any rate, to have been proposed with the aim of not filtering Middleton Road, which would not work. JK asked about the history of Middleton Road as the route alignment. OS said that it had always been the alignment, owing to being part of a direct and partially filtered connection all the way from London Fields to Essex Road (along with St Peter's Way, De Beauvoir Square, Northchurch Terrace, and Northchurch Road). It had been part of the LCC's various cycle network proposals from the very beginning. The route had also been known as the 'Maurice Hope Cycle Route' for some reason, after a local boxer.

JW asked for a vote of thanks to be recorded to the people working on it, and the meeting gladly obliged.

5. Hackney Cycling Survey

RA said that the actions on the survey had happened. OS asked why the survey hadn't been circulated in the format he had asked for, as he still hadn't seen the questions. RA said that it had gone out before Christmas. OS said that he had been under the impression that the LCC survey, which had gone out at that time, was a different survey. As we had discussed the Hackney questions as late as the January meeting, it had to be.

RM said that people had been standing on street corners to tell people about the survey. RA said that the target was 500 people and already about 400 people had completed it.

6. Web-site

DL asked for contributions to the site, saying it was easy to register and contribute, e.g. putting up blog posts.

Work was ongoing and there was still a lot to do.

7. Finance

2016 Burns Night 'wash-up': DH presented the (nearly) final accounting from this year's edition, which had been very successful. We still had some left-over bottles that we were selling, but overall the figures were finalised.

Profit was 17% down on last year, which was due to four main changes. We were 6% down on ticket revenue, with attendance 4% down (six people), and the net profit from the bar was down 10%. Three areas of expenditure had gone up: the piper had charged 20% more, the band had been paid £100 more, and the cost of vegetables had increased by 40%. OS said that the band's original terms had been restored after they had agreed to lower them for the previous year's edition. BP said the veg had come from a local organic supplier, which was why it had been more expensive. She said she thought it was still a very good profit.

RK said that the balance of pricing of alcohol and pricing of tickets might need to be looked at. She had heard comments that ticket prices were too high. We thought that bar prices could be put up, as it had been comparatively cheap.

MF said that the raffle proceeds were up to £467, compared to £390 the previous year. This money went to Pedal Power, the cycling club for people with learning disabilities, and we did not take any of it.

Dunwich Dynamo 2016 consideration and review of risk analysis: DH explained the issues that had arisen around VAT. The net profit from DD catering over three years had been around £4,000. We had been compelled to release £2,000 of this to HMRC but the remaining £2,000 had been successfully devoted to the London Courier Emergency fund and remained a legacy of our involvement. He had three questions to help in determining whether we wanted to do it again. The first question was whether we could maintain adequate net profits, which should be at least £1,000. Secondly, could we raise prices by 15% to cater for VAT? Thirdly, what was the impact of growing commercial competition? (Quite a few other outlets now opened for food on the night.)

He said that there might be a possibility of adopting a voluntary approach by asking for donations instead of charging fixed amounts. This was high-risk, but legal. Also, was there still sufficient volunteer interest?

BP and OS said that they were quite sure we wouldn't be able to do it as a group, as the VAT issue was unresolvable and did not allow for a worthwhile profit to be made. Also, as the work had been shared with volunteers from the London Fixed-gear and Single-speed Forum (LFGSS), half the profits had always gone to the forum's preferred good cause, the London Courier Emergency Fund (LCEF). The meeting accepted the recommendation and we agreed to let the organisers know.

HCC financials: 2015-16 outturn and 2016-17 budget before submission to LCC: DH said that the above two issues both affected our budget-setting for the coming year. He had budgeted £1,000 from the Dunwich Dynamo in the draft budget, which would disappear.

He proposed a budget against the financial principles we had agreed last year, of a minimum of £1k as reserves, recommending we didn't go much beyond £1k, as LCC policy was to try and restrain unused reserves. (This, combined with our previous expectation of the higher income from the Dynamo, had meant that we had declined our 2015 LCC grant on this basis. DH had since tried to claim this retrospectively, and at one stage had been told we could still get it, but it had been declined again. He said that he would ask for it once again based on the Dunwich Dynamo decision we had just made.) Another assumption was that we would continue to devote the Burns Night raffle to charity and not to ourselves. Also, we would certainly apply for the 2016 grant. The forecast outturn for this year was a deficit of about £1,000.

DH went through draft budget items and asked whether they ensured we were achieving the greatest impact. Items included Burns Night, administration costs, and a potential Cycling Showcase budget (OS suggested to perhaps use this for the proposed Gillette Square Cycling Festival that we had discussed at the February meeting). He had reduced the budget for the Annual Meeting by £120 and had significantly increased provision for campaigns. On the workshop, he said that we hadn't given them anything for years, but he thought that their work was so important that providing £250 was sensible. The draft campaigns budget of £1,250 was mainly designed to support the 'ward asks'. BP said that not every ward would require that level of leafleting currently needed for London Fields, so we might not need all of this.

There was also £500 earmarked for new equipment. DH asked what we wanted and how we would keep it. BP had made a list of needed items. JK suggested portable NO2 monitors to gather some data on air quality. JW said that we had to be careful about monitoring, as it was difficult to set up experiments that didn't lead to possibly variable outcomes. We wondered if we could get someone to talk about it in a future meeting. BP said that the London Sustainability Exchange organised distribution of pollution tubes for two-week experiments. She said that particulate monitors were horrendously expensive. JK said that we should buy a projector. A screen would also be useful.

MF said she would take the question about the workshop back to the other volunteers. Some of the volunteers were going to be trained in sizing bikes. They had some money for

this and might need some equipment.

OS asked whether we could organise one or more other fundraising events. RK asked about whether a summer ceilidh would work. Various longer-serving volunteers said that we had tried this once and it hadn't really worked, as people didn't expect to go to a dance event in the summer. RK said she would think about other possible events.

DH said he was not going to be at the April meeting, but that the finalising of the budget could probably be held over to the May meeting.

8. Garage

RM said that she still hadn't seen the garage but wanted a lot of space in it for the family cycling equipment she was keen to store there. She said she would have a trailer, a cargo bike, a Japanese bike, a 'back and front' bike, and other things. DL said that the last time he had looked in it, it had been a 'complete mess'. He thought at that time our equipment had taken up less than half of the space.

BP asked whether she should notice to the other party using the garage that we needed the whole space. We thought about the cost of paying for the whole garage. £10.75/week was the full price. Currently, we were paying two thirds of this, about £370.

OS said that the Brox needed to be repaired. DL said he had discussed the Brox with TP and they wanted to have it repaired and used this year.

MF suggested asking for donations for Brox use, which could help pay for the garage. RM said we could also ask for donations for family cycling equipment. RM said we might be able to do some fundraising with interesting bikes, going around London Fields, for instance.

BP suggested forming a 'garage sub-committee' to take a rigorous look at stuff. OS, DL, and BP volunteered. BP said that terms of reference for use of the garage had to include how to manage the equipment.

Action: BP, OS, and DL to audit the garage and make recommendations to the group.

9. Hackney Bike Workshop (Clapton branch)

DL said that the Clapton workshop was very understaffed at the moment and needed more volunteers, both as mechanics and as other helpers, e.g. to make coffee or welcome people. MF said that there were lots of positive stories from the Bike Workshop and we should consider publishing some of these.

10. Current consultations

Seven Sisters Road: NG introduced the current consultation on [six ideas or aspects for the wide stretch of street between Manor House and Amhurst Park](#), as part of the Seven Sisters Road Modernisation Plan. This was a partnership between TfL, Berkeley Homes, and Hackney Council. It was not a scheme yet, just a preliminary consultation. She said that some of our volunteers had met officers and discussed the plans. Some councillors

from nearby wards were petitioning their residents against any change at all.

Idea 1 proposed changes to traffic lanes, with three lanes to two lanes, and one lane as bus lane, increasing width of the footways, with some increase in traffic congestion expected. Idea 2 was for partial changes to traffic lanes, with three lanes at junctions to help with traffic flows, which meant that the footway could not be widened at junctions. Idea 3 proposed an increased number of pedestrian crossings, which would lead to slight delays for vehicular traffic. Idea 4a was for a central reservation and Idea 4b for a wider central reservation that would allow tree planting, possibly with more pedestrian crossings. Both ideas would reduce the potential for widening the footways and increase delays for vehicular traffic. Idea 5 was for segregated cycle tracks, which would reduce potential for increasing the footways in size and would also include slight delays for vehicular traffic. Idea 6 was to increase the width of bus lanes from 3m wide to 4.5m wide, so that the bus lane would be of shareable width, which would reduce the potential for widening footways and likewise increase traffic delays. The consultation would close on the 9th March and a scheme would probably be implemented around 2018.

There had been some commentary on Cyclescape on the ideas. We considered the draft consultation response. There was some debate about whether we should ask for Ideas 5 and 6 to be modelled, or just for Idea 5. OS said this was an irrelevant point, as all ideas were probably going to be modelled, anyway.

OS said there was still lots missing from the consultation response, e.g. the difficult issue of the Vartry Road junction (just across the borough boundary in Haringey but very close to the Amhurst Park junction and relevant to the design). JC asked if the width of the bus lane in Idea 6 was the same as the combined width of bus lane and bike lane in Idea 5. JK said that it was not quite as wide, as there was a difference of 50cm. OS said that we needed to add more discussion on junctions.

Further discussion centred on whether or not to vote on supporting Idea 5 or 6. OS said that this decision had already been made for the meeting by recent LCC AGM resolutions and was not in the power of the meeting. Formally, voting would only call into question the LCC's governance agreements on this issue, even if the vote came out in favour of the content of the resolutions. RA said she still wanted a vote and thought it was important to vote. RK raised a point of order, saying that there was no counter-proposal. Some questioned how anyone could disagree with Idea 5. RK said she was not convinced by the safety argument in favour of segregated cycle tracks. She said it was necessary to look at junctions first.

A vote was held, with the following outcome. Idea 5: 16 votes, Idea 6: 2 votes, Abstentions: 5. OS said he abstained because of the reason for not holding the vote that he had given earlier.

RA said we should get something brief out tomorrow to members. JK said we could submit our longer consultation response after advising members on what the group supported.

Lower Clapton Road/Urswick Road: NG had organised a meeting with TfL on the 10th March. She was unable to make the meeting herself, but OS, JK, SM, and RM had expressed an interest in going. NG said that TfL were happy to receive a response after the consultation deadline. RK said that since there had been such significant interest, she

proposed to discuss the scheme in more detail at the next monthly meeting.

SM asked for us to complete our response earlier than later, as he had to do his responses on behalf of the LCC, to put it out on LCC social media, before the consultation deadline, and earlier, not later consultation responses would help him with his work.

11. Ride Leader Training in February

SB thanked those who came on the training and said that she thought we needed quite a lot more to comply with LCC's regulations. SDr said he had been involved in the conversation SB had had with the office and he thought the ride leader training was sufficient. In particular, ride leaders did not need to be DBS-checked.

RK reminded the meeting that as several members of Tower Hamlets Wheelers had been on the Ride Leader Training, the Wheelers needed to contribute some money to the cost. DH was pursuing this.

12. Rides

No upcoming rides were discussed.

13. Any other business

The chair did not call for items.

We had run out of time by this point and were unable to take the following items:

Bike Week: Carried over.

Stamford Hill: We found that we could not carry over this item to the April meeting, as the consultation deadline was the 18th March.

Mare Street between Andrews Road and Westgate Street: Carried over.

The meeting closed at 10pm.

Date of next meeting: Wednesday, 6th April, 2016, 7:30pm.