

London Cycling Campaign in Hackney

Monthly Meeting

Wednesday, 3rd December, 2014

Marcon Court and Aspland Estates Community Hall

Present: Alex Cooper, Kate Charteris (committee member without portfolio), Harry Fletcher-Wood, Natalie Gould, Ned Hercock, Jono Kenyon (committee member without portfolio), Rita Krishna (committee member without portfolio), Charlie Lloyd, Richard Lufkin, Dave Lukes (sustainability officer), Ruth-Anna Macqueen, Gerry Matthews, Trevor Parsons (co-ordinator), Brenda Puech (events co-ordinator), Oliver Schick (secretary, minutes), Peter Snell, Tim Warin, Chas Wilshere (workshop representative), Abigail Yartey.

Apologies: David Altheer, Siobhan Blackshaw (rides co-ordinator), Marian Farrugia (committee member without portfolio), Dave Harris (treasurer), Adrian Weidmann (committee member without portfolio).

1. Minutes and matters arising
2. Old Street/City Road
3. Web-site migration
4. Hackney Cycling Hub
5. Draft response to 'Hackney People on Bikes'
6. 2014 election campaign follow-up
7. Burns Night
8. Silvertown Tunnel
9. Any other business

Action Summary:

Item	Action	Who
July 2014: 2. Election campaign follow-up	Contact residents in the Frampton Park area, possibly hold a stall.	SB
July 2014: 2. Election campaign follow-up	Create display maps of filtered areas.	TP
July 2014: 2. Election campaign follow-up	Provide storyboards for videos or animations.	TP
July 2014: 3. Bike Week feedback	Write a report on the Showcase for the next meeting.	KC
July 2014: 3. Bike Week feedback	Draw up a checklist for organising future breakfasts.	KC
November 2014: 6. Hackney Marshes	Draft comments objecting to increased car parking	TE; TP to chase up.

provision on Hackney Marshes.

5. Draft response to 'Hackney People on Bikes'

Submit response.

Committee

1. Minutes and matters arising

Skyway: Skyway hadn't won their 'People's Millions' bid. [The 'head to head' phone vote had gone to the 'Colour the Capital' project.](#) We had alerted our members to the vote.

Hackney Marshes: We were not aware what recent progress had been made on this.

Action: TP to chase up with Hackney Marshes User Group.

Cycle Parking: TP reported that the cycle parking survey was going well. He was doing about a third of the borough. The aim was to achieve 25% of resident parking and 10% visitor parking. There was no money at present, but there was hope that it would be found on the basis of the information in the survey.

RLu said that in one case he knew of, cycle parking that had been in the planning application hadn't been put in. TP reported on a recent meeting with a developer, who had said that pre-application advice in his view was actually not worth the money, and that it was very hard to get anyone to come out to check on whether conditions had been discharged. We thought that this was certainly an area in which more work was needed.

2. Old Street/City Road

We had a long discussion of this scheme. TP updated the meeting on recent events, and the current draft out for consultation (to close on the 17th of January). A start to the works was envisaged for the end of 2015.

We had begun to prepare a leaflet showing its drawbacks. OS explained some of the background and the motivation behind the scheme. It was mainly driven by the presence of the Inner Ring Road through the junction and the desire by Transport for London (TfL) to maintain through motor traffic capacity there, as well as the desire by TfL to develop the central area and to raise revenue in this way.

DL said that the only reasons for the proposed layout given in the consultation were station access and motor traffic volumes. We had always argued that much better station access could be achieved if the corners were developed rather than the centre. BP argued that the scheme did not cater for the capacity of bike riders in the morning peak.

JK said that a crossroads would be much better, but he was worried that it was not a very strong argument that the development would destroy views along Old Street. He said that views across the junction were currently already very poor. He had brought photographs to the meeting showing this. OS explained that this was due to the current poor alignment of Old Street, which was a legacy of the widening of the footway north of Old Street, in the course of developing the roundabout. We had already corrected this skewed alignment of

Old Street in our drawing and were confident that the view corridor along it would be greatly improved with a crossroads.

We discussed the cycling-specific component of the scheme and agreed that the leaflet should include mention of the better 'potential for protected space' with a crossroads.

KC asked what action we were trying to get people to do. She thought that we should give people potential to put their own response in. We contemplated various possibilities, including a joint petition of interested organisations, a possible micro-site, or a Facebook page. There was also the possibility of holding an action event on site.

As for other groups, OS had gone to the Hackney Society AGM and raised the issue under Any Other Business (the Hackney Society did not have a mechanism for motions to their AGM). The Society had been supportive of the proposal for a crossroads. BP had gone to the AGM of Islington Living Streets, where questions had been asked about it. Hackney Living Streets was opposed to the scheme. We hadn't contacted the Islington Society again yet, but they had previously said that they were in favour of a crossroads, and we expected that they would submit a response to the consultation.

3. Web-site migration

TP and DL had started a provisional WordPress site and had started to migrate the content. They were trying to maintain the existing links via re-direction. TP said that more help would be welcome.

4. Hackney Cycling Hub

OS updated the meeting about the proposed Hackney Cycling Hub. This had been one of our ten manifesto points in the manifesto to the Mayor of Hackney, and the Council had supported it. We had since had a meeting with the Regeneration department and had begun looking for suitable sites and considered some. The rough timescale was that we were aiming for Regeneration to hold a networking event in February and for the building to hopefully become available in April or May. However, he warned that it was all dependent on the level of rent that could be achieved wherever the Hub was created, and if this was going to be too high, the project might well fail. He was going to update successive meetings about it.

5. Draft response to 'Hackney People on Bikes'

As some of the signatories of the letter from Hackney People on Bikes were at the meeting, we did not discuss the draft response much directly, but instead had a more general and wider-ranging discussion of the points raised. We clarified that LCCiH was not at odds with the LCC's policy position. The committee was going to work on the response and submit it in due course.

Action: Committee to submit response.

6. 2014 election campaign follow-up

We talked about progress on modal filtering in London Fields. Council officers had said that the Middleton Road area west of Queensbridge Road would be treated to filtering as the first under any Quietways scheme. We thought this was very good news and were determined to ensure that the same treatment would happen east of Queensbridge Road, too, although we were aware that owing to the presence of local bus routes, a scheme would be more difficult. We were generally concerned about the lack of progress on Quietways by Transport for London.

7. Burns Night

BP gave an update on the upcoming revived edition of Burns Night, our main fundraiser, which we had had to cancel for a few years owing to the lack of a suitable venue. We had previously identified the City Academy Hackney, off Urswick Road, as a good place to hold it again, at a reasonable venue hire cost. It had a huge capacity, much bigger than Sir Thomas Abney School, where the event had been held for most of the years of its existence, and we thought that we could have a really good event there. We discussed arrangements for ticket sales and volunteering and called for more volunteers.

8. Silvertown Tunnel

We had meant to discuss more traffic schemes, but ran out of time and only managed to cover the proposed Silvertown Tunnel. RLu had asked for this to be put on the agenda. He said that it would lead to much higher motor traffic flows and worse air quality. The consultation deadline was the 18th December. CL said that LCC would be responding, but that as the issue was bigger than cycling, it was something that a broad coalition of groups should work on, and that LCC was not expecting to take the lead. There was a plan for a mass mobilisation of LCC members to oppose it. HF-W said that it was the thin end of the wedge. OS strongly agreed, pointing to other potential road-building plans in the pipeline.

9. Any other business

Date of next meeting: As usual with the January meeting, there was a question whether we should hold it on the first Wednesday (7th January 2015) or on the second Wednesday (14th). We opted for the 14th January, at 7:30pm.

The meeting closed at 10pm.