

## London Cycling Campaign Policy Forum

**Minutes of Meeting of 29 July 2015,  
at 6.30pm at the LCC's offices at 2 Newhams Row, London SE1 3UZ**

### **Present:**

#### *Forum Members:*

Rachel Aldred, chair (Hackney, Board), Spencer Harradine (Bromley, outer boroughs), George Coulouris (Camden, inner boroughs), Philip Loy (Lambeth, inner boroughs), David Arditti (Brent, outer boroughs), and Anthony Gilmour, secretary (Lambeth, general membership).

*LCC staff:* Tom Bogdanowicz (Senior Policy and Development Officer) and Charlie Lloyd (Campaigns Officer).

*Other LCC Members (observers):* Nicole Lee (Lambeth), Alastair Hanton (Southwark), and Steven Edwards (Camden).

### **Agenda**

- 1. Welcome, Apologies** (Standing Item)
- 2. Minutes of previous meeting and matters arising** (Standing Item)
- 3. Voting on one-way policy proposals** (follow-up from last meeting's debate; if we decide to support one of these, the Chair will take it to the AGM for discussion and voting there)
- 4. Discussion: Feedback from local groups on policy compliance** (see circulated document)
- 5. Updates on other current policy projects** (Standing Item)
  - 5.1 Filtering/Motoring Grid** (see link circulated from Andrea) – Tom H
  - 5.2 Inclusive cycling** – Rachel
  - 5.3 Modelling** – Rachel
  - 5.4 Motor vehicle enforcement** – Anthony
- 6. Possible new policy projects** (Standing Item)
- 7. Recent & Upcoming Seminars** (Standing Item) – including ideas for new Autumn seminars, for discussion
- 8. AOB** (Standing Item)
- 9. Close;** next meeting Weds 28th October at LCC offices

### **Actions Summary**

- (1) Item 2.2 (matters arising): RA would circulate a version of the assessments mentioned in item 2.3 the minutes for 29 April 2015.
- (2) Items 3.5 & 3.6 (one-way streets): RA to put advice papers as agreed on the LCC website; (the stance to be case by case, rather than neutral).
- (3) Item 4.1 (feedback from local groups on policy compliance): RA to give some comments to the Board, and to start an email discussion on defining a core network (item 4.1.4).
- (4) Item 5.4 (motor-vehicle enforcement): AG to liaise with CL about a possible seminar.
- (5) Item 7 (future seminars): RA to consider suggestions made for seminars; and TB to try contacting Philippe Crist.

# Minutes

## 1. Welcome, apologies

1.1 The chair welcomed those present.

1.2 There were apologies from Kristy Revell, Gareth Redmond, Kevin Hickman, John Wood, and Oliver Schick.

## 2. Minutes of the last meeting and matters arising

2.1 The minutes for 29 April 2015 were agreed as circulated, with corrections in items 2.3 (CLOS assessments) and 6.1.6 (briefing paper on filtering and the motoring grid)

2.2 Rachel would circulate the assessments mentioned in item 2.3, but might need to tweak them first. We would discuss CLOS again today under AOB – 8(1) below.

**Action: Rachel**

2.3 Update on Action Points Summary:

- (1) Rachel had given Ashok a summary of our views on new roads capacity, and would now follow up with the minutes.
- (2) Drafting some general principles on one-way streets: Done, and discussed in 3 below.
- (3) Giving feedback to the Board on the LCC policy & governance papers: Done.
- (4) Rachel was liaising with others in the filtering and traffic grid work, but there was no briefing paper yet.
- (5) The proposed seminar with Andy Clarke had happened.

**3. Voting on one-way policy proposals** (See 3 in the minutes for 25 February, 4 in those for 29 April, and the draft statements circulated for this meeting and set out in the appendix below)

3.1 We discussed the merits of such a statement of principles. Various points were made:

- 3.1.1 Many thought that the LCC had a policy on one-way streets, when it didn't. How best to counter that?
- 3.1.2 We needed principles to guide campaigners, not necessarily to take to the AGM.
- 3.1.3 Having a policy would help get money spent wisely.
- 3.1.4 Some thought that the LCC should be make clear that one-way working for motor vehicles should sometimes be accepted, though our discussions so far had already helped establish the point.
- 3.1.5 Others wanted the LCC to be more neutral on the point. (a) Circumstances varied greatly, and there were complex interactions with wider matters such as the public realm. Thus a cycle track could go with a one-way system which might benefit cycling but spoil the area. (b) One-way systems (such as gyratories) often had serious problems, and we shouldn't give the impression that we thought that they were all right.
- 3.1.6 We needed to be careful how we presented such issues because of the room for misunderstanding.

3.2 The meeting discussed whether to put a motion to the AGM. Some wanted it to go to the AGM this year as that was the best way to settle a principle, and would also lay down a marker for campaigners elsewhere. Others had worries about that:

3.2.1 Should we be making policy piecemeal through AGM motions?

3.2.2 The huge diversity of circumstances couldn't be distilled into an AGM motion.

3.2.3 The AGM could not easily deal with any detailed statement. Any motion to the AGM should be simple like the shortest of the statements proposed.

3.3 The meeting discussed several options:

3.3.1 We could defer the question to the new policy system being proposed at this year's AGM.

3.3.2 If we were to do something this year we could have a background note (such as Rachel's note) and either a motion for the AGM or a statement to be approved by the Board.

3.4 The Forum **voted** on whether the Forum should take a motion to the AGM this year:

For: two

Against: three

(We noted that that did not stop others doing so.)

3.5 The meeting discussed how policy should be published and spread across the LCC, if not through motions to the AGM.

3.5.1 As things stood, the Board did not have a process for approving policy.

3.5.2 The Forum could prepare advice notes and put them up in its own right on the LCC website. (We discussed openness and the website.)

3.5.3 We could have a process for LCC members to discuss such papers and get to grips with them. We could put something in *London Cyclist* and on the LCC blog.

3.5.4 We agreed that it would be good to publish the LCC's position in this case. One suggestion was to encourage discussion by giving examples, such as of contraflow cycling that had worked well, and that had worked badly (such as Bermondsey Street).

3.5.5 We agreed to put up a short statement, with the detailed paper as an appendix.

**Action: Rachel**

3.6 The Forum discussed whether the advice should be neutral about one-way streets.

3.6.1 We agreed that they could be accepted: it was wrong to rule them out. But there was still some difference of view or emphasis.

3.6.2 Some members of the Forum saw one-way working for motor traffic as merely a tool in the tool box.

3.6.3 However, others generally disliked such one-way streets, but agreed that they could sometimes be accepted, perhaps as the best that could be achieved in the particular circumstances.

3.6.4 We discussed the use of judgment in complex situations, and the importance of leaving that to campaigners dealing with particular situations on the spot.

3.6.5 One factor was practicalities such as local highway authority practice, which might vary. (Thus the City used different techniques from other authorities for marking out contraflows on side streets, and for marking out pedestrian areas.)

**Agreed:** The stance of the advice was to be case-by-case, rather than neutrality.

#### **4. Discussion of feedback from local groups on policy compliance** (see the spreadsheet circulated)

4.1 Rachel had been asked to discuss that feedback with the Forum. It included questions put by local groups. She ran through some of the items on the spreadsheet:

4.1.1 The Bromley query about the 1999 policy on shared use routes: The meeting noted that the statement was long and detailed, and had been prompted mainly by the widespread practice then of putting cycle routes on pavements. It had not been helpful in Bromley, where they were dealing largely with 'rural' off-road routes, where the 1999 policy didn't apply. It was **agreed** that the 1999 policy should be retired because it was out of date; but that some bits might still be good, and we could always come back to it.

4.1.2 The Ealing query about one of 2006 resolutions – Motion 4: We noted that the motion had been about a lack of minimum standards for cycling facilities, and was out of date because there were now reasonable standards, in the revised London Cycling Design Standards. (If we needed a motion now, it might be about failing to follow standards rather than a lack of standards.) It was **agreed** that 2006 Motion 4 should be retired.

4.1.3 2006 Motion 3 (people should not be compelled to use cycle facilities, but should be able to make an informed choice): Though there had been no query about it, David said that he would be happy to see that, too, go. (If you had good cycle infrastructure, why would you want to use the carriageway?) But others argued that the point was still right and important, partly because there was an important point about liability at stake.

4.1.4 The Havering queries:

Point 1 asked how to define a core cycle network. The meeting noted that that was a big issue, and discussed some options. We could follow the Dutch by saying that it was routes carrying 2000 cycles per day. But in the UK we might need to think partly of potential cycling. We could show such a network on a map (as some borough groups such as Southwark and Islington had done). But we could not define it that way, because the question was what qualified routes to appear there. (Though even there maps could be used to help show problems.) Defining such a network could give a context to those boroughs that hadn't put lines on maps. We noted that identifying a route could be prompted by road proposals, and ideas on a network develop in a piecemeal way. It was **agreed** to

deal with the matter by email. Rachel would get out her detailed note supporting 20 mph speed limits and circulate that. <sup>1</sup>

Point 2 was a buses point: It was asking for something like that for outer London, rather than querying the policy for central London.

#### 4.1.5 The Merton queries:

Point 1, that PCUs differ from the unit of measurement used by the LCDS: We did not see that as a big problem, though the heavy vehicle aspect needed watching. Point 3, about problems of making policy by AGM motions: That was partly overtaken by the proposals now in train for the process for AGM policy motions.

#### 4.1.6 The Newham point: No need for the Forum to respond.

#### 4.1.7 The Westminster query: That raised an interesting point about design standards. The Forum made these points:

- \* We should aim for higher standards than the LCDS, but should have flexibility about what to agree in practice.
- \* It was **not** LCC policy to reject what didn't meet our standards: what to accept was a decision for campaigners on the ground, given all the circumstances.
- \* Some in TfL wanted us to help push for better standards in TfL and elsewhere.

**Action:** Rachel to tell the Board about the policies that we thought should be retired, and to circulate the note mentioned under Point 1 in 4.1.4.

4.2 The meeting discussed the purpose and scope of this discussion. The queries had arisen because the question about recent policies had caused borough groups to go through old policies. The Forum was inclined to leave it generally to the Board to consider further whether old policies were in force.

## 5. Updates on other current policy projects

### 5.1 Filtering and the Motoring Grid (See 6.1 in the minutes for 29 April and earlier references there):

5.1.1 Oliver was ill, so not there to speak on his work.

5.1.2 David had talked to his group and they had made some progress with extending the motoring grid (in Camden and Islington) to Brent. See the statement on Brent Cyclists' website<sup>2</sup>. (DA circulated copies of a printout.) They had had problems because the cells were very large unless they included some lesser roads.

5.1.3 There was a brief discussion of such work. It was useful as a cycle planning tool, but might not present well in the public domain. (People might worry about displaced traffic, and about schools on the through roads.)

5.1.4 The Forum agreed to call the grid for now the 'traffic grid' – or rather (at David's suggestion) the 'through traffic grid'.

---

<sup>1</sup> We referred here also to relevant guidance by Brian Deegan. See for instance the LCDS guidance on mesh density, at section 2.3 in the current edition at: <https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/cycling>

<sup>2</sup> [ <http://www.brentcyclists.org.uk/content/proposed-motoring-grid-brent> ]

5.1.5 We could ask Amy Summers to include David's work as part of the resources for activists which she has been putting together.

5.2 Inclusive Cycling (See 6.2 in the minutes for 29 April and earlier references there): Rachel said that work was continuing. For instance, a response was being submitted to the current House of Lords select committee inquiry on the Equality Act 2010<sup>3</sup>.

5.3 Modelling (See 6.3 in the minutes for 29 April and 6.2 in those for 25 February): There was not much to report.

5.4 Motor-vehicle enforcement (See 6.4 in the minutes for 29 April and earlier references there): Anthony had nothing new to report, as he had been too busy. Charlie said that LCC were part of the traffic justice alliance, which was planning the next London traffic law enforcement conference (after the first one last year). However, some issues would be good for a smaller forum such as a seminar. We could work together on a seminar. However, some of the obvious speakers were hard to get hold of, including Martin Porter and Ralph Smyth. Anthony would liaise with Charlie.

**Action: Anthony and Charlie**

**6. Possible new policy projects:** None suggested.

**7. Recent & Upcoming Seminars** (See also 5.4 above)

7.1 Rachel was planning a webinar on 16 September. It would be about the Calgary cycle track network trial, which was put in quickly. We might find that useful.

7.2 Other ideas: there were these suggestions:

- A presentation by Mark Strong on area porosity analysis (in the LCDS).
- A seminar or workshop on lorry control (HGVs).
- How the media cover cycling. Could we get Tom Edwards as a speaker? (We discussed media generalisations and failings about cycling.)
- Junctions. But we had had have a seminar on that. The LCC were working on a seminar on junction design, though not strictly policy. (Tom suggested that Marcus Jones would be a good speaker on roundabouts, including TRL's test of Dutch-style roundabouts.)
- What about Philippe Crist, as suggested before?<sup>4</sup> Rachel hadn't heard back from him. Tom B would try contacting him.

**Action: Rachel and (on the last point) Tom B**

**8. Any Other Business:**

8.1 Cycling Level of Service (CLOS) assessments:

8.1.1 Rachel said that there would be a follow-up workshop on CLOS after the one that Brian Deegan had already run. But it would be a general LCC workshop, rather than a Policy Forum one.

8.1.2 The meeting discussed CLOS assessments, and these points were made:

---

<sup>3</sup> [See: <http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/lords-select/equality-act-2010-and-disability/>]

<sup>4</sup> That is, to do an international comparison of the benefits of cycling facilities to commuters. See 6.2 in the minutes for 26 November 2014.

- As CLOS was now in the LCDS<sup>5</sup>, might we need to adopt even standards across the LCC? Shouldn't we decide what level to demand? A 70% score was what the Camden group had settled on somewhat arbitrarily as the threshold for cycle-friendly infrastructure.
- Before coming to a decision, it would be helpful if a group of us were to look at some junctions and so on and apply CLOS to see how it works.
- We should be wary about setting any level because it would cause target-driven behaviour, and so all sorts of problems. (There would be a focus on areas where it's easier to score highly, and so on.)
- Even so, LCC's Campaigns Committee had adopted a 70% threshold; and no highway scheme of any sort should have 'critical fails'.

8.2 The position taken lately on HGVs: See emails of today.<sup>6</sup> The meeting **agreed** that the action had been reasonable in the circumstances, but generally we wanted policy to go through a process. The wider process could be discussed with Ashok.

**9. Close:** The meeting ended at 8.39pm. Next meeting: **28th October** at the LCC offices.

---

<sup>5</sup> See chapter 2 at <https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/cycling>

<sup>6</sup> [The death lately of a cyclist killed by a lorry at the Bank had brought public calls for further action, particularly a rush-hour ban on HGVs. LCC officers had had to react fast and had supported such a ban as part of the LCC's End Lorry Danger campaign. Thus the LCC had taken a policy position though there had been no time to run it first past the Policy Forum.]

[Draft statements on one way streets – possible motions for the AGM: see item 3 above]

[Gareth R's draft]

LCC believes that one-way streets should in general allow two-way cycling. LCC will support one-way streets where they introduce or protect space for cycling and will oppose or attempt to improve them where they do not. To improve one-way proposals, LCC will normally press for speed reduction measures, contraflow cycling and facilitation of pedestrian crossing; but local campaigners are best-placed to judge how to apply these principles to the circumstances of specific local proposals.

[Philip L's revision]

LCC believes that one-way streets should in general allow two-way cycling. LCC will support one-way streets only if they introduce or protect space for cycling and are conceived as part of an overall traffic calming and/or traffic reduction measure to improve streets as living areas for people. LCC will oppose and aim to improve proposals where they do not have such objectives. To improve one-way proposals, LCC will normally press for speed reduction measures, contraflow cycling and facilitation of pedestrian crossings; but local campaigners are best-placed to judge how to apply these principles to the circumstances of specific local proposals.

[David A's suggestion]

LCC believes that one-way streets should in general allow two-way cycling. LCC may support the introduction of one-way working for motor vehicles where it introduces or improves Space for Cycling, and will definitely oppose conversions of major roads from one way to two-way working if such schemes do not simultaneously introduce protected Space for Cycling in both directions on each main alignment through the scheme. In the cases of proposals for one-way working and existing systems LCC will normally press for speed reduction measures, two-way cycling and facilitation of pedestrian crossing; but local campaigners are best-placed to judge how to apply these principles to specific local circumstances.

[Note from Rachel:] I have added the first sentence of David's suggestion to the other two, following suggestions from Rik [Andrew] and Clare [Neely].