

## London Cycling Campaign in Hackney

### Monthly Meeting

Wednesday, 4<sup>th</sup> May, 2016

### St Chad's, Haggerston

**Present:** Rachel Aldred, Blaine Cook, Kylie ap Garth, Natalie Gould (joint consultation co-ordinator), Jono Kenyon (co-ordinator), Rita Krishna (fundraising co-ordinator), Angus Macdonald, Gerry Matthews, Juan Pablo Orjuela-Mendoza (Imperial College), Marta Lucia Orjuela-Mendoza, Trevor Parsons (joint web editor), Oliver Schick (secretary), Vincent Stops, David Vellala, Tom Watson, Chas Wilshere (workshop representative).

**Apologies:** Siobhan Blackshaw (rides co-ordinator), Tim Evans, Dave Harris (treasurer), Dave Lukes (joint web editor), Ruth-Anna Macqueen (community outreach co-ordinator), Brenda Puech (events co-ordinator), James Woodcock.

### Agenda:

1. Minutes and matters arising
2. Juan Pablo Orjuela-Mendoza (Imperial College) on air pollution
3. Vision process
4. Bike Week
5. Hackney Cycling Conference
6. Finance
7. Current consultations
8. Other events
9. Rides
10. Garage clean-up
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	Provide more information on the 'ward ask' for Hoxton East and Shoreditch.	FD
July 2015: 1. Minutes and matters arising: Q&A	Enquire about progress with Lebon's Corner (Dalston	OS

<b>session with Feryal Demirci, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods</b>	ward ask).	
<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>	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>March 2016: 8. Garage</b>	Audit the garage and make recommendations to the group.	BP, OS, DL, TW
<b>April 2016: 4. Hackney Cycling Conference</b>	Think about possible input to the conference about Hackney cycling businesses.	OS
<b>3. Vision process</b>	Organise a Vision workshop.	OS

## 1. Minutes and matters arising

**WFCC liaison:** JK had spoken to Simon Munk of WFCC about an informal ride around

Waltham Forest in July. He was going to continue liaising to settle on a date.

**Council liaison:** JK had met Cllr Demirci (Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods) and requested a formal meeting with Streetscene about CS1 schemes that hadn't been completed. The consultation results about the De Beauvoir filters north of Englefield Road hadn't yet been published. The Ball's Pond Road crossing hadn't happened yet because of a modelling question; TfL said they would have to reverse a banned right turn from Ball's Pond Road to Southgate Road to make the scheme between Culford Road and Kingsbury Road happen, as otherwise there wouldn't be anywhere along Ball's Pond Road to turn right in a southerly direction.

**Missing 'except cycles' signs—two-year update:** TP requested a correction to item 8 in the April minutes, which implied that the missing 'except cycles' signs were for the most part found in contraflow situations. However, their absence most often failed to indicate that 'no through roads' were permeable for cycling. BC said that he had attempted to bulk import the data on the missing signs to FixMyStreet. It was easy to do, but he hadn't gone through with it as he didn't want to associate it with his own e-mail address with the work. He suggested using different e-mails from group members who lived near each instance, or perhaps one per quarter of Hackney. TP said that Streetscene already had the data and he had also had a response from Andrew Cunningham that he'd look at the issue. OS said that it would be great to build on such mapping work to have a map for the Vision.

## **2. Juan Pablo Orjuela-Mendoza (Imperial College) on air pollution**

We had invited Juan Pablo Orjuela-Mendoza owing to a recent increase in interest in the topic of air pollution in the group. He was from Bogotá in Colombia and had studied environmental engineering there. He had then worked for an NGO in Washington, monitoring emissions associated with different travel interventions. He was presently completing a PhD at Imperial College and had been in London for three years, most recently working on the Physical Activity through Sustainable Transport Approaches (PASTA) project. He asked everyone present to sign up to [the on-line survey of the project](#).

He began by explaining the basics of what air pollution is. It was composed of emissions from mobile, fixed, and natural sources of gases or particulates discharged into the atmosphere. One of the main concerns was what exactly comes out of the tailpipes of vehicles. There had recently been big news about Volkswagen and NOx, as well as other follow-up scandals.

Gases and particulates from emission sources normally dispersed in the atmosphere, reacted, and moved around. However, cities were under clouds of pollution more concentrated than in other places owing to the presence of more sources. He said he was not going to talk about how to measure what comes from sources, but instead how we measure the different kinds of pollution that are there.

There were Air Quality Networks in almost every city, including in London. They normally took measurements at 10 or 20 metres above the ground, as measurement devices tended to be attached to mobile phone masts. What these stations measured was not what people breathe, as few people travel at this kind of elevation. At the more local level, there were monitors for measurements in or around homes, as well as portable monitors.

He next listed the different substances that are involved in air pollution. First, there were different gases.

CO was carbon monoxide. It was toxic to humans, the product of incomplete combustion, and before catalytic converters had come along there had been even higher levels of CO. CO poisoning caused blood to stop moving through the body and death within hours. Examples of how this could happen were if a stove was left turned on or a car was stuck in a garage with its engine on. Even though it was toxic, the concentration of CO required to die from it in the open air was very high and it was very unlikely to happen. Other substances were more hazardous, e.g. Oxford street was not a highly polluted street because of CO.

CO<sub>2</sub>, carbon dioxide, was a non-toxic greenhouse gas (GHG), the product of complete combustion. Its presence 'felt like smelling people', e.g. after a meeting in a closed room, and that 'if we don't do anything about climate change, that is probably how everything will feel'.

NO<sub>x</sub>, different nitrogen oxides, were also toxic. They were not GHGs and were associated with diesel fuels. They were not to be confused with N<sub>2</sub>O. NO<sub>x</sub> comprised the main pollutants in Oxford Street.

O<sub>3</sub>, ozone, was a 'secondary pollutant'. It was also toxic.

Apart from gases, there was also particulate matter, e.g. solids with liquids on top of them. The abbreviations PM<sub>10</sub> or PM<sub>2.5</sub> referred to different sizes of particulates. PM<sub>2.5</sub> was what was normally measured.

PM<sub>10</sub>s were short-lived climate pollutants (SLCP). They were carcinogenic carbon nuclei surrounded by all sorts of things.

Black carbon was a SLCP, an elemental fraction of PM, associated with diesel fuels, and carcinogenic.

In response to these pollutants, tree-planting was not all that effective, as we were not short of oxygen, but instead had to find relief from plenty of other problems.

In measuring pollutants, the Air Quality Network gave an 'urban background' by means of fixed stations which didn't have emission sources directly next to the stations. There were also roadside stations directly near traffic pollution sources. They measured different pollutants. Fixed stations typically measured CO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub>, O<sub>3</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and SO<sub>2</sub>. Roadside stations measured NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>.

Fixed stations were immensely important. The data they collected was constant over many years. They were very precise devices, well-calibrated and well-maintained. While nobody was affected by pollution at these stations, they gave the 'urban background' data that was essential for research. These stations used gravimetric processes and light dispersion processes to measure pollutants, e.g. by comparing the weight of their air filter at the start and at the end of a measurement interval. They did not provide knowledge of events that happened in the time elapsed, however.

Portable devices only worked on light dispersion. They were not very precise as they didn't measure mass.

PM target levels were defined by lawyers and engineers and were rather arbitrary and not very meaningful thresholds.

Finally, personal exposure monitors measured pollution right where an individual encountered it. There were chillingly direct links between pollution and people's health, e.g. two or three days after high pollution events, there will typically be a rise in heart attacks.

While, he said, we were all dying slowly because of our exposure to particulate matter, there were possibilities of fighting air pollution. One was in dealing with black carbon. This not only killed us but also had a greenhouse effect. In contrast to CO<sub>2</sub>, however, it had no 'base concentration'. The CO<sub>2</sub> we emit could take 100 years to be removed from the atmosphere, as there was a base concentration of it, which meant that a reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions could not be felt very quickly. However, this was different with black carbon. With SLCP, the impact of any measure to reduce it could be seen in a week. Also, in the absence of human activity, a black carbon concentration would only be measurable near volcanic ash or things like that.

Black carbon was generated by things like braking or tyre wear, physical processes which produced bigger particles than chemical processes. That it is black was what causes it to block out the sunlight. The quick results of reducing black carbon made it politically powerful as the impact could immediately be felt, e.g. in a week.

GM asked about something she had heard on Gardener's Question Time about planting flowers in tyres, which, it was said, caused poison from the tyres to leach into the soil. JPOM said that at the same time, tonnes of tyre dust were dumped in London every day, and this was air pollution that got to vulnerable people, e.g. children under 5 and elderly people. He said he was not an expert in solid waste. Clearly, both solid and non-solid waste could be poisonous, but yes, the pollution from tyres used for planting was probably not very high.

JPOM showed a portable device and said the numbers gathered by it were not as high as one might expect. AM asked whether the data was robust enough to draw conclusions. JPOM said that the device he had was one of the best and was currently used in the PASTA project. It was very expensive, but durable and measured black carbon. It gathered data for five minutes and then averaged them at the points between these intervals. Other methods of measuring that were being tested included pigeons wearing measuring bags. Devices for measuring CO were very cheap.

He next explained in which projects the data was used. There was the AirMap, which measured the concentration of people near mobile phone towers based on mobile phone data. To this were added NO<sub>2</sub> concentration maps, which resulted in activity-based exposure maps.

Without mobile data, the assumption had to be made that the data reflected exposure throughout the day, and the mobile data helped with differentiation. One project was CAVA in Barcelona. There, people decided to share their location data, and there was also data

on which modes of transport they used, and whether they were indoors or outdoors. This resulted in an hour and day-specific ratio using background stations. Their energy expenditure could be estimated from accelerometer data, which gave figures for air pollution inhalation. There, too, smartphone data was used to estimate exposure and inhalation.

The PASTA project concentrated its research on how to promote active mobility through the use of different modes of transport. It was EU-funded and was happening in seven EU countries. The aim was to get people cycling and walking and to measure their inhalation rates. The partners in London were the City, LB Haringey, LB Newham, and LB Bexley, and individuals could be partners regardless of where they lived in one of the seven cities, i.e. not only in participating boroughs like Newham.

The project had three different stages. The first was a longitudinal survey on how or why people moved around, what they did for leisure activity, etc. It also included reporting on crashes or near misses. There was a health component to the survey, which included health assessments, e.g. a picture of the retina was taken to assess the blood pressure of each participant. The goal was to have 2,000 people participating in every city. London was behind all other cities in this.

JPOM stressed that it was good to keep cycling, as research into how safe it was to cycle in respect of air pollution had shown that the health benefits associated with activity outweighed the costs of inhaling air pollution. There were many ways of measuring benefit from physical activity. In answer to a question, he said that he would even give this advice to people in Beijing, and that there was no city in the world where cycling wasn't beneficial to the rider in spite of pollution.

RA mentioned that there was a new paper on air pollution coming out the next day, co-authored by Audrey de Nazelle, JPOM's doctoral supervisor. She also asked whether it was worth putting up community air pollution monitors outside schools or other places like that, or whether one should simply measure motor traffic as a proxy. JPOM said that the more data could be gathered, the better. KCL were developing a 'hybrid model' to combine different data sources. However, he said, it was important that projects must be cared for, and that someone had to analyse the data, e.g. schools must not forget to look after their monitoring stations. As another example, there was great measuring infrastructure in Colombia, which was actually better than in London, but the problem was that the data was not looked at as much. He also warned that it was possible to say anything with data, and that it had to be backed up by a deep understanding of the subject-matter. That aside, the devices were good enough to provide good data, and in schools, children were very receptive to understanding air pollution. The devices would be good enough to pick up the benefits of, say, an intervention of modal filtering around a school, and help with documenting the difference pre- and post-implementation. More data was good, but data may also not be necessary if it could clearly be observed that buses and lorries were passing a school.

Motor traffic as a proxy worked well as an indicator of air pollution, but it had certain limitations. For instance, there were secondary pollutants, the products of primary pollutants' reactions with the atmosphere. When using motor traffic as proxy, secondary pollutants were missed, which meant about 20-30% of data. There were ways of estimating these based on the area, but this was indirect.

GM said that in Tower Hamlets, she thought it would be useful to monitor air pollution before and after the planned modal filtering around Cable Street. JPOM said that this would not fit into the PASTA project, which was about increases in physical activity, but that there were definitely ways of using that type of local data in projects. There were lots of Masters students working on dissertations for three months over the summer who could do projects around such data. GM said that KCL were working on schools around the Blackwall Tunnel.

Discussion turned to how away from the source one should be to be relatively safe from air pollution. JPOM said that it depended on quickly air pollution dispersed and diluted in given atmospheric conditions. For instance, while 100m from a road was often quite a safe distance, in London there was a fairly stable atmosphere and pollution didn't get diluted as much. 200m from a road was a safer distance in London, and 500m was even better, but of course not achievable in most areas of London.

JPOM closed by giving a short overview of the state of other research in this area. Research into dust tracks was not quite advanced enough to be considered reliable. The project that used pigeons to carry bags for analysis was too recent to be fully evaluated yet. An initiative to crowdfund a CO monitor was not the best use of resources in his view, as it was simpler to measure several gases, of which CO should be one. It was a 'boring substance'; while it could be used as a proxy, people didn't die from atmospheric CO owing to the high concentrations required.

The meeting thanked JPOM for coming and his interesting talk.

### **3. Vision process**

OS said that following both major Mayoral candidates' commitment to the 'Sign for Cycling' programme of 'one "Mini-Holland" in every borough', that it was important to reactivate the Vision process, so that we would have a priorities list ready if and when it arrived as a funding programme, although he did wonder how it could possibly be financed. JK said that 'Mini-Hollands' would not be £30m per borough, but town centre improvement schemes with somewhat less funding. OS suggested a Vision workshop on this.

RA said that it was important to share the Hackney Cycling Survey on social media, although she wouldn't leaflet for now. She mentioned Mark Strong of Transport Initiatives' area porosity analysis on cycle-friendly streets in Hackney. RK said that in order to solve especially knotty problems, not just popular problems, we should do both. JK agreed. RA said she could say something about the survey results at the June meeting. We could also invite Mark Strong to present his data. OS wondered whether we could do a Strawbale Sessions themed around the Vision.

OS said that progress on 'ward asks' was also crucial, and whether some of the 'Mini-Holland' funding might be applied to these. Another key issue was funding for consultation around modal filtering schemes, as these needed a relatively high consultation budget.

**Action:** OS to organise a Vision workshop.

### **4. Bike Week**

We were only going to do two Bike Week events in Hackney, one being Bike the Bounds on Saturday the 11<sup>th</sup> June and the other the Cyclists' Breakfast on Wednesday the 15<sup>th</sup> June. We were also going to do the Finsbury Park Cycling Festival on Sunday the 12<sup>th</sup> June.

## **5. Hackney Cycling Conference**

The conference was going to be on Friday the 10<sup>th</sup> June. We had been sent some early information on the speakers and programme. Tom Cohen (UCL) was going to chair, and we were going to receive a small allocation of free tickets. OS suggested reciprocating the recent ticket offer by the Haringey group for their conference.

GM queried why the conference was at the Picturehouse. She did not like the venue and thought it scored poorly on accessibility grounds, as well as having an ongoing labour dispute. JK suggested she write to the organisers about these concerns.

## **6. Finance**

DH had had to give his apologies, so that we were unable to discuss the 2016/2017 budget.

There were several other financial issues. One was that the 2015/16 accounts had been submitted to LCC. We also discussed whether the group should support RM in going to the Women and Cycling conference in Hereford by paying 75% of her train fare (£45). RK said that there should be a policy for such decisions. OS said that he thought we should continue to handle them informally, and that there was some precedent. He had once been sponsored by the group to attend a training event run by the Project for Public Spaces (PPS), and TP added that we had supported Adam Thompson to go to the Ciemmona event in Rome. TP said this sort of thing should be discussed by the committee in advance (RM had contacted JK and DH as co-ordinator and treasurer, respectively), although he, too, was in favour of a continued informal way of handling it.

CW reported back from a meeting of the workshop volunteers, in which they had voted in favour of accepting £250 which we had provided for in the budget. CW had been against, as he thought the workshop should be self-funding, but the workshop had accepted the money. TP said that the £250 was a provision in the budget, not an automatic donation. The workshop could apply to us for funding up to that figure, stating what it needed the funds for, and then we would consider the application on its merits. CW said that the workshop didn't need the money and that he thought it was not right to take it.

We had not heard anything new about the proposed summer fundraiser. JK wondered whether we could possibly combine it with the event we wanted to do with WFCC.

We concluded by anticipating that we might consider the budget at the next meeting or outside of a meeting if it had to be done earlier.

## **7. Current consultations**

**Urswick Road/Lower Clapton Road:** JK and OS reported back from a meeting they had

with TfL about this proposed scheme. JK gave some context and described the scheme. We had tried to have a meeting with TfL before, on the 10<sup>th</sup> March, but that hadn't happened.

Officers told us that there had been two motivators for the scheme, one that the junction had a crash record that would make a safety scheme worthwhile, and the second that senior management in TfL wished to replicate the success they perceived of a 'de-engineered' scheme in Bexleyheath. JK said that at this junction, bus movements were markedly different from Poynton and Bexleyheath. OS outlined his concerns with wider area traffic management that might be caused by this scheme.

The question was whether the scheme would happen, considering the imminent changes in London politics after the Mayoral and London Assembly elections on the 5<sup>th</sup> May, as well as possible competition from other schemes that had been mentioned to us by officers.

BC asked whether the scheme would be monitored. JK said that experiments of this nature had been made before, and that it was these experiments that should have been monitored rather than a new scheme. RK said that TfL did do monitoring. For example, they had had to take out 'orcas', a smaller version of the 'armadillos' used to demarcate semi-segregation owing to them having proven to be a tripping hazard.

Officers expected that the consultation report would be out in June

## **8. Other events**

RA announced an event on the 9<sup>th</sup> June, organised by the LCC's Policy Forum, on how to create Liveable Communities by removing through motor traffic. This was going to be at the University of Westminster's Baker Street campus.

She also announced the next LCC Policy Forum Seminar on the 23<sup>rd</sup> May, on a 'propensity to cycle' tool.

## **9. Rides**

There were no rides planned imminently.

## **10. Garage clean-up**

DL, who had had to give his apologies, had asked when this was going to happen. TW was volunteered to help. We noted the various different uses to which we wanted to put the garage in future.

## **11. Any other business**

**Victoria Park:** BC said that there was a campaign, led by Tower Hamlets councillor Josh Peck, on keeping Victoria Park open after dark. Tower Hamlets Council was looking at this. It had been demanded increasingly as it looked likely that the Hertford Union Canal could remain closed for another year. There was a possibility of perhaps moving the park boundary to the south of the east-west path from the Royal Inn on the Park to the junction of Wick Road and Cadogan Terrace.

The meeting closed at 10:15pm.

**Date of next meeting:** Wednesday, 1<sup>st</sup> June, 2016, 7:30pm.