



Hackney Cycling Monthly Meeting November 2018

Attendees: Jono Kenyon (Coordinator), Tom Knowles, Natalie Gould (Secretary), Richard Lufkin, Garmon Ap-Garth (Committee Member), Gordon Quilty, Carol Gray.

Apologies: Dave Harris (Treasurer), Harry Fletcher-Wood (Consultation Coordinator), Ruth-Anna MacQueen (Community Outreach), Rachel Aldred (Research and Insight).

1. Minutes and Matters Arising

With regard to the plans for the Balls Pond Road cycle lane on CS1, RL had recently written to Will Norman, who had responded and said that RL should write to Andy Cunningham at Hackney. JK said he should also copy in Feryal Clarke (Hackney Council) and Claudia Webb (Islington).

2. School Streets Campaign

JK said that our School Streets promotional video now has 1000+ views. JK attended a talk/conference with Sustrans on behalf of HCC, and our video was played at that event. A council officer explained the Hackney School Streets programme and stated that Hackney is most ambitious borough in the country. Other boroughs that have experimented with School Streets have had difficulties because they have not seen it through.

TK noted that Lancell Street in Stoke Newington may be one of the next School Street schemes; he did not believe that there are, as yet, any similar plans for the William Patten School. Hackney Council has produced a tool kit for other councils wishing to implement similar schemes in their boroughs.

GQ has written a letter for Queensbridge School. Planters have been installed outside the school which provide separation from the motor traffic on Queensbridge Road. However, he notes that there has been no action to reduce motor traffic on Albion Drive.

3. Burns Night 2019

NG said that she had met with Brenda Puech and Dave Harris to discuss arrangements for the 2019 Burns Night Fundraiser. The tickets are ready to be put on sale. JK said that he would be happy to do a flyer.

There were no volunteers for scrounging the prizes for the raffle but it was suggested that Ruth-Anna Macqueen may be able to do this.

4. Current Consultations.

Stoke Newington Gyrotory



RL said that TfL had held a drop in session regarding the proposals¹ for the Stoke Newington Gyratory and that it got 'quite lively' straightaway with people wagging fingers in the faces of officials, which is unacceptable. Gary Morris attended from Hackney Council. RL believed that TfL should have had more people there, booked a bigger room and had someone to manage the event. People were reportedly saying that TfL had not distributed the consultation leaflet to their home, and RL said TfL should have the delivery tracker data to hand so that they could show those people that somebody had actually walked up to their front door to deliver the consultation pack. There is another drop in session on Saturday from 12:00-14:00 and the venue is bigger, but the event is shorter. On the positive side of things, RL notes that there were a fair few people were in favour of the scheme but they were much quieter.

JK said that the scheme has been put up on Cyclescape, and he believes that the scheme is not ambitious enough from a cycling perspective and it is too biased towards buses. Nevertheless, the scheme as proposed will represent an improvement to the High Street. It was unfortunate that the starting point of the scheme was to 'get rid of gyratory' rather than to create liveable streets.

CG said that one-way streets are never more liveable. JK said that 'liveable' is a road that parents and children can cycle on. CG responded that 'liveable' should include all road users, including pedestrians; JK said he did not intend to exclude pedestrians.

CG said one-way streets give drivers a licence to drive faster, and they generate more journeys because drivers/motor vehicles have to take a longer route. But RL and JK said that the speed of drivers is influenced by the width of the road.

CG says that we should be asking for more than one design to be considered and she cited a study carried out by Hackney Council in 2014, which is not mentioned in this consultation. The study provided three options which may be of benefit to cycling. GApG said that if there are positive features in the other options, then they could be included.

CG said that the scheme should have modal filtering on the side roads in the middle of cells, and full two-way working on the High Street to make for shorter journeys. JK the problem with creating two-way working was that it increased the road network and potentially made driving more convenient. RL said that two-way working would increase capacity/traffic on the southbound alignment of the high street.

The current TfL proposal was then put up on the projector.

CG said she did not like the parking/loading bays in the cycle lane.

¹ <https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/roads/stoke-newington-gyratory/>



JK said the TfL is actually removing the gyratory and that he doesn't have a problem with restricted access on the southbound route.

CG said there would still be cars coming through the area, and if you restrict cars, then you get longer journeys. RL said that with filtering you are restricting motor vehicles but you get evaporation rather than longer journeys; the restricted access on the southbound carriageway is way of encouraging more cycling and promoting alternatives to motor vehicles. JK said that LCC has a policy which is that for roads with >2000 pcus per day, there should be protected space for cycling.

CG said that two-way working would provide more access to commercial space. RL responded he disagreed with the idea that we should open up towns to more motor traffic.

With regard to the TfL scheme, it should be clarified what type of cycle track is proposed.

JK said TfL had said that the southbound carriageway had been made bus & cycle only because there was an unacceptable delay to bus routes as it was mixed motor traffic.

The bus stop outside the William Patten School serves routes 73, 473 and 476 and TfL may want to move it. TK said he anticipated that the bus stop would be moved before scheme is built. It was agreed that the eastern end of Stoke Newington Church Street should be made part of a red route outside the school.

TK suggested that the loading bay north of Church Street (on west side of the high street) should be and businesses could use the Wilmer Place carpark instead. It was observed that the only businesses next to the loading bay were a lawyers' office and one restaurant.

JK explained that north bound cycle lane on the high street was 'tidal' in nature and there was very little cycle traffic in the morning.

TK said that additional loading could take place in Lawrence Buildings (east of the High Street).

Just south of Victorian Road there is a loading bay, and the cycle lane should be routed behind the bay, and loading take place across the cycle track.

At the Brooke Road junction, the northbound cycle lane should be continuous, and a cycle-only signal could be on green except when pedestrians are crossing. Pedestrian crossings should be provided on all three alignments of the junction.

North of the Brooke Road junction, the loading bay in the northbound carriageway is sub-optimal. Ideally it would be cycle only track, but this is not possible then there should be strict CCTV enforcement.



North of Church Street there should be more cycle provision, which should be possible if loading can take place in Wilmer Place carpark (it is noted that there is a loading bay in Garnham Street).

On Rectory Road the median strip in the road should be removed, since this will encourage fast motor vehicles. We would also like to see an alternative southbound cycle lane for those not wanting to share with buses on the High Street, such alternatives include Sanford Terrace or Rectory Road.

Next meeting will be on Wednesday 5 December 2018 in Pembury Community Centre.