

## London Cycling Campaign in Hackney

### Monthly Meeting

Wednesday, 1<sup>st</sup> June, 2016

### St Chad's, Haggerston

**Present:** Rachel Aldred, Siobhan Blackshaw (rides co-ordinator), Blaine Cook, Harry Fletcher-Wood (joint consultation co-ordinator), Garmon ap Garth, Natalie Gould (joint consultation co-ordinator), Dave Harris (treasurer), Brian Jones, Jono Kenyon (co-ordinator), Rita Krishna (fundraising co-ordinator), Alan Limbrick, Richard Lufkin, Dave Lukes (joint web editor), Angus Macdonald, Ruth-Anna Macqueen (community outreach co-ordinator), Gerry Matthews, Trevor Parsons (joint web editor), Brenda Puech (events co-ordinator), Oliver Schick (secretary), Marcus Schodorf, Vincent Stops, Bernard Tulkens, Chas Wilshere (workshop representative), James Woodcock.

**Apologies:** Jasmina Cenan, Katie Hanson, Matt Saywell, Adrian Weidmann.

### Agenda:

1. Minutes and matters arising
2. Hackney Cycling Survey initial findings
3. London Fields modal filtering consultation report
4. Bike Week (including Finsbury Park Cycling Festival)
5. Hackney Cycling Conference
6. Finance
7. Current consultations
  - Hackney Police Station planning application
8. Other events
  - Freecycle feeder rides
9. Rides
10. 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	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>	Find out the likely cost of stickers and to do a design.	TP
<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>December 2015: 1. Minutes and matters arising: Actions for Feryal Demirci</b>	Chase up Cllr Demirci about progress.	HF-W
<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>February 2016: 3. Gillett Square Cycling Festival</b>	Co-ordinate organisation.	AB, BP, RM, RLu
<b>February 2016: 9. Other events</b>	Convene an events planning session.	OS
<b>May 2016: 3. Vision process</b>	Organise a Vision workshop.	OS
<b>3. London Fields modal filtering consultation report</b>	Draft a letter and consult the committee on it, over the seven days following the meeting.	JK
	Compose a briefing sheet to go along with the letter.	NG
	Organise a letter-writing campaign by individuals to write letters to their councillors.	Committee

<b>7. Current consultations: Hackney Police Station</b>	Send a short note supporting the comments of Hackney Streetscene and TfL ahead of the planning committee meeting discussing this application.	TP
---	---	----

## 1. Minutes and matters arising

**Liaison with WFCC:** JK had sent a Doodle invite for a date in July to have a meeting or a ride around Waltham Forest. This could take place on a Thursday or Friday evening.

**Council liaison:** JK suggested deleting the outstanding actions concerning Cllr Demirci, as they had not been done for a long time. RK said we should invite her to a meeting and ask her to come with answers, not delete the actions. All agreed. Action: JK to invite Cllr Demirci to a future meeting.

**Vision process:** OS had not yet managed to organise a Vision workshop. He was thinking of asking Hackney City Farm if they had space.

**Response to Hackney CCG:** JK said that a response to CCG was in draft and he would circulate this to the committee before sending it.

**Police liaison:** DH had had a response back from the police on his letter about 20mph enforcement. They had said they were happy to come to a future meeting.

**20mph:** TP hadn't done stickers yet.

**Pembury Road/Cricketfield Road/Downs Park Road/Queensdown Road junction:** OS was still aiming to write a longer piece about the whole area, including Clarence Road, and how traffic schemes there should work together.

**Gillett Square:** It was looking unlikely that there would be a cycling component to a festival in the square this year. There was going to be a festival the coming week-end but it would not feature input from us.

**Garage:** DL, BP, and SB had done an inventory and cleared out the garage. The meeting moved a vote of thanks to them. We also decided to rent the whole garage, as more space was going to be needed for RM's family cycling library.

## 2. Hackney Cycling Survey initial findings

RA presented some initial findings and provisional conclusions from the Hackney Cycling Survey, as well as suggested next steps. There had been limited publicity for the survey because of other goings-on, but it had still attracted a good level of responses, 245. It had been in two sections, one about specific geographic locations and one about more general priorities. Some respondents had only answered the first bit, some only the second, so that there weren't 245 for both sections.

She presented some demographics of the respondents. They were generally people who

rode quite a lot, three times a week or more, and most were in Hackney's main postcodes of N16, E8, E5, and E9. Most were aged between 25 and 64, and 82% said they were white. Most were LCC members, and a were not sure if they were LCC members.

The geographic information that people gave highlighted places that were good or bad for cycling. People had identified 239 good places and 282 bad places. There had not been that many reports for certain streets, perhaps because people didn't cycle there as much. The points had been plotted on OSM. In Stamford Hill, there were notably very few points. There had not been much variation in reports, e.g., the A10 was considered largely bad, whereas the Porter's Route was generally considered good. One person disliked the idea of people cycling in parks. Usually, people liked the same things, except certain streets like the CS1 route.

One of the good things was not having motor traffic. Filtering had come out strongly here. There had been variations of responses on the theme of filtering. As for bad places, the frequency of motor traffic featured quite strongly, e.g. where people drove too fast, where there were wide roads, car parking, or two-lane traffic. Some residential streets had been highlighted as problematic.

As for what kind of changes should be made to bad places, the main suggestion was to reduce interaction with motor traffic, e.g. in reducing car parking, introducing segregated cycle tracks, reducing the number of lanes, or reducing motor traffic. One respondent suggested making motor traffic delivery only (on a residential street). RA thought that Hackney Council's transport strategy principle of 'clear space' applied along entire corridors, e.g. the A503 Seven Sisters Road, the A107 Clapton Common etc.

The map gave a sense of the problems people experienced. There was a cluster of green dots in De Beauvoir, more red dots elsewhere.

On the safety of child cycling, 10% said it was very safe, while 62% said it was dangerous or very dangerous. Hackney came out quite well in a London-wide comparison on this question.

As for priorities, to ensure that one option didn't come out on top owing to ordering of the options, they were presented in random order to respondents. 177 answered, and 71 (41%) picked segregated cycle tracks on main streets. The next most popular was modal filtering, at 8% (20 respondents), as both reduced interactions with drivers.

RA thought it was interesting to present the data by considering how many people picked each intervention in their top three priorities. This resulted in a picture of 62% for tracks, 44% for filtering, with 20mph in third place. People also wanted fewer lorries, more enforcement, and to see gyratories returned to two-way operation.

As for conclusions and next steps, the Council were conducting reviews of principal routes. The question for us was what we would like to see on those. Also, to get more people involved, we asked respondents whether they would want to be involved in a campaign about a specific place if they had said a particular place was bad. Some specific issues were not highlighted on the map, but general problems had come out clearly in comments people made, and in some cases it was possible to see that it was an area-wide problem, e.g. filtering made a really big difference.

RA said she was still doing some more number-crunching and was interested in linking the data to the index of multiple deprivation, or to link it to near-miss data from an earlier project of hers. She was also keen to present the results to the council, as this was a good chance for us to tell them what we would like, or to find out whether the Council would want to help with the survey next year, e.g. would the Council be willing to send surveys to every household? She said it was important to get additional involvement.

HF-W asked how representative the findings were of trends found across London in the larger LCC survey. RA said that it featured the kinds of things you expected people to say they like, e.g. filtering/parks/tracks had all been popular. RK asked about the different ways of presenting the data by first priority or the top three priorities and the difference it made. RA said that with the top three priorities considered, filtering came out as much more important.

VS asked about how 10% thought cycling in Hackney was safe for children and wondered how this compared to other boroughs. RA said that this was probably better than the rest of London, but she would make a comparison with the other London data. VS also asked where 245 lived. Were they all across the globe or in Hackney? RA said that only 180 people had given postcodes and that 168 were in one of the four biggest Hackney postcodes.

AM asked whether it was only Stamford Hill or whether there were other areas that had not been well represented. RA said that you did get bias as to where people cycled, and that we could get information on cycle flows and compare them with the data. JK thought it was worth mapping where respondents were from. RA said that mapping this wouldn't be that good, as only the first half of the postcode had been asked for, for data protection reasons. JK thought it was good to have this data for the Vision process, as it was geography-based.

VS asked if RA could share the data. RA said that that wouldn't be a problem. OS asked about the level of responses, which he thought was surprisingly low; he had expected a web-based survey to generate substantially more responses than our previous surveys. He asked whether the survey was still to be kept open to get more. RA said that if we were to increase the level of responses, we would have to do it with the Council. The survey was still open but had tailed off quickly. OS said that he had been under the impression that almost no publicity had been done for the survey so far, to prevent it from clashing with other priorities for action in the run-up to the Mayoral election, and whether there should not now be some more publicity. RA said she wasn't sure that standing around on street corners would get us that many more. OS said that we already knew what the same old suspects thought, e.g. white LCC members, but that it would be much more interesting to reach a wider and larger demographic. JW thought it was better to reach groups like that through the Council. OS said that there was nothing new about the survey compared to what we had always known. JK suggested doing more survey action through Bike Week. He thought it was right to widen it to a non-cycling conversation and proposed to do a short link and a mini-flyer for the conference and the Finsbury Park event.

BP asked whether there could there be a short presentation at the conference. RA said she was speaking, but not on this.

### 3. London Fields modal filtering consultation report

JK introduced the outcome from the recent consultation report. There had been four options. Option 1 had been the one we had supported, of complete filtering of the area, although we had said during the consultation that it had flaws (which a trial would have brought out). Options 2+3 had been different varieties of filtering on Middleton Road itself, and Option 4 had been for width restrictions. Under Option 4, 10% of daily vehicles would be filtered out (large vehicles).

The consultation report had identified Option 4 as the recommended option based largely on an analysis of which consultation respondents lived inside the area and which ones lived outside it, and we thought that this decision was disappointing. While seemingly popular with local residents, this was not popular with Hackney residents in the wider area, and there were significant questions to be asked about the way in which the consultation data had been presented. Most of those present opposed a trial of Option 4.

Some thought that the consultation report was biased. 49% of respondents had preferred Option 1, compared to 35% for Option 4. On the second question, in which people had ranked the options, Option 1 had come out on top: 44% overall, and 26% in the traffic cell affected had chosen it as their preferred option. 83% of respondents had been Hackney residents, and 5% had been Hackney businesses, even though they lived outside Hackney. We thought the views of people from outside the traffic cell reflected legitimate concerns, and that the decision made was not really based on the responses to the consultation.

Other headline points were that the writers of the report had chosen to highlight one section of the consultation while ignoring others. When considering all the questions, there had been 48% in favour of Option 1, with 49% against. The only outcome that had been taken into consideration was that 67% of respondents living in the traffic cell had said they were against Option 1. The views of other residents had effectively been ignored in favour of this. We wondered whether this was a good strategy for the Council to pursue in the longer term, and were also disappointed as this had been a 'ward ask' to which the Council had agreed.

OS said that he thought the outcome was actually quite good in support of our campaign, but that this looked to be a re-run of the situation in the Victoria Park area ten years ago, when a vocal campaign had opposed the anticipatory introduction of a controlled parking zone (CPZ) there. When the anticipated problems had become more obvious (people parking in the area to catch buses to Mile End Tube station), a few years later the CPZ had then been supported, in some cases apparently by the same people who had campaigned against it previously. Just as there, here our reasoning for recommending filtering was partly anticipatory, in this case because of the expected continued increase of through motor traffic in residential streets. He thought that this was going to increasingly be perceived as a considerable problem in the local area, and that the issue would be back in a few years' time.

OS said that it would not be possible to construct a width restriction between the junctions of Middleton Road with the A10 Kingsland Road and Haggerston Road, so that it would have to be east of Haggerston Road, leaving this open for continued flows of large goods vehicle traffic. This would then most likely use Scriven Street. There had already been

strong support for filtering from people living on Scriven Street as things stood. Ironically, given the levels of opposition around Albion Square, were Scriven Street to be filtered, and probably even to some extent before it would be filtered, large goods vehicle traffic would also use Albion Terrace, as Albion Square was not filtered completely, probably owing to the difficulty of filtering Albion Terrace. He said that this and other problems illustrated why a piecemeal approach like the one the Council had accepted from the flawed consultation report did not work, and why it was always essential to filter whole traffic cells.

This led to a discussion of whether some partial filtering based on areas in which people had already supported it would be a good step forward. Some thought this was a good idea, but others thought we should concentrate on challenging the basis for the decision.

RA said that if you reduced through motor traffic, benefits were felt quite quickly, e.g. close passes might change from one per week initially to one every two months.

We decided to write to local councillors and to encourage all members to write to their local councillors, too.

JK said he would draft a letter to the Council within the next seven days, and consult the committee on it. NG offered to draft a briefing sheet with bullet points based on Fume-free Streets' analysis of the consultation report.

We had heard that the decision was going to be made at a cabinet meeting at the end of July.

**Actions:** JK to draft a letter and to consult the committee on it, over the next seven days. NG to compose a briefing sheet to go along with it. We were also going to call on individuals to write letters to their councillors.

#### **4. Bike Week (including Finsbury Park Cycling Festival)**

We had a final discussion ahead of Bike Week. The final programme of events was:

Hackney Cycling Conference: Friday 10<sup>th</sup> June (ahead of Bike Week but close enough)

Bike the Bounds of Hackney: Saturday 11<sup>th</sup> June

Finsbury Park Festival of Cycling: Sunday 12<sup>th</sup> June

Hackney Cyclists' Breakfast: Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> June

We called for volunteers for the breakfast, and RLu, OS, BP, AM, AL, GG, SB, and MS volunteered. Katie Hanson had also indicated she could help. We decided to promote membership and the survey there.

We were going to have a large family stall for the Festival, with a family try-out area featuring cargo bikes and tandems, and races and fun for kids. OS, RM, JK, and Rlu volunteered to come.

SB asked what neighbouring boroughs were doing in Bike Week. GM said that Tower

Hamlets Wheelers were doing their usual breakfast. There was not going to be a glamour ride during Bike Week this year.

## 5. Hackney Cycling Conference

We had a small allocation of tickets for the conference and asked for takers. BP, AM, OS, CW, and JK wanted to take one each. We also thought we should put it out on the mailing list and invite neighbouring borough activists to avail themselves of the opportunity. Haringey had offered us tickets to their conference, and we wanted to reciprocate the favour.

## 6. Finance

DH presented the current budget for 2016/17. He had this year requested the LCC grant. The projected spend was £2900 pounds, although he cautioned that we might not be sufficiently organised to spend that amount. He was looking for processes, owners, and commitments, as he wanted to avoid underspend. He queried whether we should keep the budget allocation for £250 for the Cycling Showcase, as it was not clear whether anything like this would be organised this year. There were some proposals for other uses of the money, but overall the meeting thought it wouldn't be necessary to keep the allocation. We also discussed the proposed policy for agreeing travel or event expenses for members.

## 7. Current consultations

- **Hackney Police Station planning application**

**Contraflow on Wetherell Road:** NG mentioned that this was going to be implemented soon.

**Columbia Road:** There had been some confusion before the meeting about whether anything was being consulted on concerning the actual crossing of Hackney Road, as Tower Hamlets Wheelers had seen leaflets sent out to residents. GM clarified that the consultation concerned a general sprucing-up of the area south of Hackney Road, including new proposals for easier-to-ride cobbles in Columbia Road.

**Hackney Police Station:** TP highlighted that the planning application to turn the former Hackney Police Station into a school now included a proposal to create coach drop-off bays in St John's Churchyard next to the school, presumably to bus pupils in. This had not originally been part of the application. He suggested we send a short comment to Hackney's planning department that we supported the comments by Hackney Streetscene and Transport for London. All agreed. (VS, Chair of Hackney's Planning Committee, did not recuse himself for this item, as he was not going to be at the meeting making the decision on it.) **Action:** TP to send a short note ahead of the planning committee meeting.

## 8. Other events

- **FreeCycle feeder rides**

Nick Perry had offered to again organise Hackney's part of the FreeCycle feeder rides on Saturday 30<sup>th</sup> July and was calling for volunteers. NG and RK said they were possibilities.

## 9. Rides



SB said that she needed to check what other groups were doing in Bike Week, but that she had no rides planned.

#### **10. Any other business**

**Meeting venue:** RM said that there was a possibility of perhaps meeting in a community hall in Upper Clapton. This might be low-cost, effectively for a donation, although a difficulty was that it would not be available on Wednesday evenings.

The meeting closed at 21:57pm.

**Date of next meeting:** Wednesday, 6<sup>th</sup> July, 2016, 7:30pm.