

## London Cycling Campaign in Hackney

### Monthly Meeting

Wednesday, 5<sup>th</sup> November, 2014

### Marcon Court and Aspland Estates Community Hall

**Present:** Mohan de Benoit, Siobhan Blackshaw (rides co-ordinator), Alex Cooper, Tim Evans, Dave Harris (treasurer), Jono Kenyon (committee member without portfolio), Rita Krishna, Richard Lufkin, Dave Lukes (sustainability officer), Sam Mars (Skyway), Trevor Parsons (co-ordinator), Brenda Puech (events co-ordinator), Oliver Schick (secretary, minutes), Adrian Weidmann, Chas Wilshere (workshop representative).

**Apologies:** Kate Charteris (committee member without portfolio), Marian Farrugia (committee member without portfolio), Harry Hewat, Maggie Jacobs (Petchey Academy).

### Agenda:

1. Minutes and matters arising
2. Sam Mars presenting the Skyway Bike Champions project
3. Draft Hackney Transport Strategy
4. 2014 election campaign follow-up
5. Burns Night
6. Hackney Marshes
7. Finance
8. Current consultations
9. Rides
10. Other events
11. 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
3. Draft Hackney Transport Strategy	Finalise the draft of the response and circulate.	OS
6. Hackney Marshes	Draft comments objecting to increased car parking provision on Hackney Marshes.	TE
11. Any other business:	Work with ICAG on establishing a joint position on	TP, OS

---

## 1. Minutes and matters arising

**July 2014: 2. Election campaign follow-up: TP had been thinking about ways to** represent our suggestions for strategic modal filtering across the borough. A simple and reasonably clear way was to outline the coarse-grained network of streets which would be retained for through motor traffic, and to shade the resulting adjoining filtered areas in different colours, as our neighbours in Islington have done for the south of their borough. (See <http://is.gd/islingtonfilters>.) OS mentioned that Harry Hewat had begun to explore making some drawings for the draft Vision, including area maps. He passed around a drawing Harry had made for the Dalston Lane/Lower Clapton Road/Mare Street Narrowway/Clarence Road junction.

## 2. Sam Mars presenting the Skyway Bike Champions project

Sam introduced himself as a fundraiser for Skyway, a Hackney charity working with vulnerable young people, based at the Blue Hut on Murray Grove. They worked through Hackney Council for Voluntary Services (CVS). He said that Hackney CVS was probably the best one in London.

They did activity nights for young people and in particular bike maintenance workshops with young people, getting bikes from the Met Police, often in very poor condition. As most kids they worked with had now 'done' their own bikes, repairing them and making them rideable, they were asking why they should do any more bikes, so Skyway had come up with new projects.

To realise these projects, they had applied for £50,000 through the 'People's Millions' Big Lottery Fund programme on ITV. This paired projects up against each other (ITV News were going to do 1-2 minute interviews with projects) and let the public vote on them, which many people found appealing as they wanted to feel that they had some say in where National Lottery money went.

Skyway were up against a very good recycling project in Waltham Forest. Sam said that charities competing against each other was unfortunate, but there was no way around the format. The programme went further, however, as there were two stages: The public vote on the 25<sup>th</sup> of November, when people could vote for their project, as well as a second round, to which those who got more votes than the other project progressed. In this round, they had to show that they could connect their project with others already happening in their local community. Community involvement was something the 'People's Millions' were really interested in.

He explained Skyway's plans for this community involvement. Firstly, the project was a step up from young people doing just their own bike maintenance. The aim was to train fifteen people to employability level: ten to CyTech level 2 to become qualified as bike mechanics (the cost for a CyTech qualification was £1.5k per person), and five people to qualify as Bikeability instructors. They aimed to tie this in with people already doing Bikeability. Young people would do pop-up events across Hackney and fix bikes free of

charge. They would also set up training arrangements with schools. There were existing projects on the Fawcett Estate (Keir Apperley) and on the Nightingale estate (Mike), so that they were concentrating on estates where there wasn't already provision.

Skyway had a very successful 'peer programme', using kids' local connections. This was better than coming in as figures of authority, as this usually didn't cause good engagement. When young people were engaged, Skyway were getting them to go along to work programmes etc.

Sam was hoping that LCCiH could help to promote the public vote, sending out a mass e-mail to the membership list. Then, if and when the project was in place, anyone with interest in the project would be very welcome to come along and help. Also, he wondered about kicking off an 'intergenerational community fun ride' next year. He wasn't sure if anything like this already existed, but we had not heard of such a ride ('Bike Around the Borough' included some adults but was mostly for schoolchildren).

The vote was 9am to midnight on the 25<sup>th</sup> November, but unfortunately Sam could not give a telephone number for this yet, as this were only going to be given out on the 25<sup>th</sup> to prevent voting fraud. It made the initiative difficult to organise, but anybody in this funding round had the same problems. He said that people were allowed to vote ten times before their number got barred, and each vote would cost 15p.

In response to questions, he said that 50% of the vote were usually people who had seen the programme, while the other 50% were people who got contacted through the sort of community groundwork that Sam was doing by coming to the meeting.

MdB asked how many bike maintenance facilities there were in Hackney. SM said that there were quite a lot of drop-in maintenance workshops, like London Bike Kitchen and the projects he had mentioned. TP added mention of Franco and his Donut Kids project on the Kingsmead Estate.

Skyway had a Facebook page and a Twitter account (@skywaycharity). Their web-site was <http://www.skyway.uk.com/>. Sam said he was going to do a regular Twitter 'dripfeed'.

The meeting thanked Sam for coming and wished him luck with the competition.

### **3. Draft Hackney Transport Strategy**

OS introduced the draft Transport Strategy, including the structure of the document and brief assessments of each of the component documents. He also explained which planning issues this tied into, and what the status of the overall strategy was.

The draft Liveable Neighbourhoods Plan, Cycling Plan, and Walking Plan were all very good, and both BP, who had been drafting a response on behalf of Hackney Living Streets, and OS agreed that the Liveable Neighbourhoods Plan was key and should be given a higher status within the suite of documents. By contrast, the draft Road Safety Plan had significant shortcomings. It had been written by a consultant and not by Hackney officers. There was also a very good Sustainable Neighbourhoods Plan, which was intended to become a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and to set parking standards.

BP and OS had had a meeting with Hackney officers and discussed the plans, feeding back our initial input as arrived at in our previous brunch discussion meeting on the 5<sup>th</sup> October. This had been a good and constructive meeting.

We discussed a number of topics in the draft Transport Strategy. We agreed that we were not very much in favour of an expansion of electric car traffic, as we saw it as a form of greenwash with the potential of locking in most of the disadvantages of car traffic while merely shifting pollution elsewhere. A better solution was to reduce motor traffic, electric or not, altogether. Support for electric vehicle traffic was required by the Mayor's Transport Strategy, however, and Hackney were unable to do much about it. Hackney officers had explained that their main focus was with rapid charging points (for a full charge in 20 minutes) in the hopes that commercial operators would switch to electric vehicles.

We discussed car parking, as we had recently found that car parking provision was being increased in some parts of the borough. We re-emphasised that car parking provision was going to have to be reduced further because parking controls free up space for cycling and walking and are one of the most effective available tools for reducing the modal share of motor traffic. We had not engaged with the Parking Enforcement Plan (PEP) process for some time, and concluded that it was time we did some new work on it with Parking. We also wondered whether there had been any success in attempts to integrate the Parking Service into the Streetscene department, as we had not heard anything about this for some time. We felt that in the same vein the PEP should be integrated with the Transport Strategy.

We discussed the proposed policy on 'clear space for cyclists' and agreed to recommend, after lengthy discussion, to ask for the following wording to be inserted after 'In Hackney, this will almost always be an on-carriageway solution': 'but we will include consideration of the provision of protected space where feasible.'

The deadline for submitting the response was Friday 7<sup>th</sup> November, but officers had indicated that a day in the next week was fine, as other respondents had also asked for a further deadline extension in view of the large size of the suite of documents.

**Action:** OS to finalise the draft of the response and circulate.

#### **4. 2014 election campaign follow-up**

LCC was organising petitions to keep the momentum going following the 2014 election campaign. Some felt that it was unnecessary to have this, as Hackney had already agreed to take forward our 'ward asks'. After some discussion, we agreed to approve the petition text as circulated by the office.

#### **5. Burns Night**

We were determined to run Burns Night again next year (the date was Saturday the 24<sup>th</sup> January 2015). BP said that we should delegate Burns Night work to the sub-group that was forming. She and others had been to see the City Academy and found it to have great facilities. The price was higher than what we had paid before, but it had a higher capacity than all other venues. We had also made a reservation on the date (Saturday the 24<sup>th</sup>

January).

SB asked if we could commit to the school. All thought that if we did, everything would fall into place. BP said that we should expect to make a £1,200-1,500 profit. The cost for using the school would be £600, which would be in line with these

All present who wanted to help were encouraged to join the Hackney Burns Night organising Yahooogroup at [hackneyburnsnight@yahoogleroups.com](mailto:hackneyburnsnight@yahoogleroups.com).

## 6. Hackney Marshes

TE reminded us that a new car park had been constructed on East Marsh without planning permission and that a new planning application was in the process of being determined for changing rooms and a new 68-space car park in the north of Hackney Marsh, near Cow Bridge, accompanied by the usual [poor quality Transport Statement](#). He referred us to the Sustainable Hackney web-site where all questions relating to the planning applications should already have been answered:

<http://sustainablehackney.org.uk/hmug/planning/2014eastmarshcarpark>

<http://sustainablehackney.org.uk/hmug/planning/2014pavilion>

We had commented on the planning application for the renewal of Cow Bridge a few years ago, objecting to the intention of allowing car traffic to cross to the Marshes again, and engaged in dialogue with officers, but this had been to no avail. The Olympic period had then led to an atmosphere in which commenting on planning applications in the area had not been fruitful and we had not done this. TE had sent to TP what he could find in our archive on the history of comments on planning applications.

TE explained that there were two stages to approving the planning application for the new changing rooms on the Marshes. Firstly, it would go through Hackney's own planning process and then to a Public Enquiry, as it involved Common Land. The first opportunity for it to go to Hackney's Planning Committee was at their December meeting, on the same evening as our next meeting (Wednesday 3<sup>rd</sup> December).

The meeting was in consensus that we should object to all such applications on the Marshes, on the grounds that we object to increases in car parking anywhere in the borough.

**Action:** TE to draft comments on behalf of the group along the above lines.

## 7. Finance

DH noted that the cheque from the funds raised at the Dunwich Dynamo had not been given to the London Courier Emergency Fund (LCEF) yet.

TP mentioned that he and DL had now succeeded in moving our online data, domains and services to the virtual server we set up a few months ago, on which we were now developing a new content management system-based website. The old server could now be decommissioned, saving us the cost of its hire. DH thanked TP and DL for reducing the

server running costs in this way.

## **8. Current consultations**

No current consultations were discussed.

## **9. Rides**

SB said that owing to pressure on her time and helping to organise Burns Night, she had no rides planned at the moment, but that she would resume organising these sometime in the New Year.

## **10. Other events**

There were no other events to note.

## **11. Any other business**

**Old Street/City Road:** TTP said that this was expected to come to public consultation shortly, and that he understood that the plans were substantially the ones we had already seen. Hackney Council was opposed to the plans and preferred a crossroads option. TP asked for the meeting to reaffirm our previous stance and to work with ICAG on presenting a joint position. The meeting agreed unanimously. **Action:** TP and OS to work with ICAG on establishing a joint position.

**Hackney Cycle Parking Survey:** The LCC had won a tender to survey all Hackney Homes estates to identify potential locations for secure cycle parking. TP was helping to do some of the surveying, along with staff from the LCC office.