Attendants

Council Co-Chair: Cllr Ian Wingfield, Southwark Council (Cllr W)
Nominated co-chair: Andy Cawdell, Southwark Cyclists (AC)
Albert Ang, Southwark (AA)
Eleanor Margolies, Southwark Cyclists (EM)
Elizabeth Eden, Southwark Cyclists (EE)
Dale Foden, Southwark (DF)
Luci Quenia (LQ)
Jack Skillen, Team London Bridge (JS)
Jeremy Leach, Southwark Living Streets (JL)
Alistair Hanton, Southwark Living Streets (AH)
Alex Ingram (AI) Wheels For Wellbeing
Ralph Smith (RS)
Mark Palmer, (MP)Southwark,
Nicola Cheetham (NC) – Southwark,
Jonathan Hampston, (JH) Southwark
Matt Beale Collins, (MBC)Community Cycleworks
Joanna Redshaw, (JR) Southwark
Pete Wood – Researcher (PW)
Amy Aeron-Thomas, Advocacy & Justice Manager (AAT)
Joanna Lesak- Project Manager (JLE)
Gary Douglas, Southwark Council - CSG Secretary/Coordinator (GD)

Apologies

Matthew Hill - Highways (MH)
Asad Ikram – Met Police (AIK)
Agenda Item 1:
Welcome and apologies Cllr Wingfield / Andy Cawdell

Agenda Item 2:
Adoption of Minute - Agreed Cllr Wingfield / Andy Cawdell

Agenda Item 3:
Roundtable updates (one/two minute update from each member)

St Thomas St – authorised vehicles only, one way.

CS4 should continue past Tower Bridge Rd.

CGS bid for contraflow on Snowfield

Jeremy Leach mentions rare consultation about Marshalsea Rd.

Jack Skillen highlights low emission bid and is currently exercising Cycling Strategy for Team London Bridge. Currently work taking place on a low traffic solutions initiative on St Thomas St and Tooley St. Support is being canvassed for C84. It should continue beyond Tower Bridge Road. A bid has been put in for contraflow on Snowfields.

Agenda Item 4:

The infrastructure blocking the entrance to Southwark Park at Gomm Rd. The entrance now does not allow access by tricycle or mobility scooter, both commonly used by people with impaired mobility.

Existing barriers were put in with community consultation. A short study by Phil Jones was commissioned in the summer. Report can’t be released as it is still in its final draft stage. For the Gomm Rd gates, - Cycle and ped are expected to use the same 1.5m gap and then share a footway, esp. if all the way to the bandstand.

Suggestion is made that the other gate be opened for cyclists. However this would keep cyclists on pavement.

Suggestion was made to re-open the main gate to a 1.5m gap so that cyclists start on the carriageway, and if there is a problem with motorcycles there will need to be enforcement.

Responses: RS asks if this report considers the CS4 and Rotherhithe Bridge that may mean a huge increase in cycling.
NC states that last year barriers were installed at Gomm Road entrance and there was a number of complaints from cyclists. A study was carried out and presented with a report but currently it is at fine draft stage. NC read out the recommendations.

RS asked if the report considered the impact of CS4 on the number of people using the barrier. RS says costings need to be considered.

NC states that she has confidence in the equipment (solution) used to test the width and number of the cyclists. NC talked about the Software modelling and highlighted how pedestrians did a lot of testing of the barriers.

NC states that info can be shared with anybody that needs to know and would welcome cooperation from the group.

**Agenda Item 5:**

**Champion Hill to Peckham Rye area-wide traffic study (area South of the A202, north of A2214/2216, but inc Champion Hill)**

Cllr W states that community council shared concern with traffic in the broader area. Bid has been put in to TfL for a study from Denmark Hill to Rye Lane. Similar to Dulwich.

Jonathan Hampston, the new engagement officer, will be taking it forward when funding is in place. The bid won’t be realised until new financial year.

RS states that the figures were traffic as a whole and asks if a split could be made. RS also asks if the ANPR cameras will be released and also enquires about the 3 year date and how that figure was arrived at?

Assuming that funding is granted for study next year, bidding could start in 19/20.

RS stated that Data collection has been aggregated for no reason.

JLE: - ATC – auto traffic counters – can’t disaggregate cyclists and motorbikes and states that we need to do some more data collection.

RS asks if we can separate out the 2 and the 4 wheel already.

EE says the level of traffic will leave the Quietway dead adding that there are good interventions planned for junctions, but they have been cancelled on Portland, St George’s Way, Camberwell Grove, Champion Hill, Dulwich.

JLE states that a baseline is normally collected, then you can do an experimental order for 6-8 months.

RS states that Hackney and Camden have been doing this and doesn’t believe that waiting for things to settle down is not reasonable.

Cllr W states that Southwark have to have a concrete evidence base.
RS says an experimental traffic order is a form of consultation.

Cllr W says we have a very high expectation of consultation in this area.

LQ says that Southwark Cyclists are already consulting on the Spine.

MP states that Camberwell Grove will be re-opened, so Southwark need to let the traffic return to normal before counting the baseline.

PW says that the bridge being closed is the baseline, re-opening the bridge will increase traffic, then there will be a third count.

Cllr W states that the key things that came out in the discussion with Community Council was a shared concern about traffic within the broader area. Southwark will put in a bid for funding.

- RS States that Southwark has aggregated the traffic flows
- DF says the data is there in place For the Degree of the study.
- JLE states that ATC’s can't differentiate between pedal bikes and motors,
- AC asks what implications does this have on the quietways going through.
- EM states the concern is the length of the Quietway 7 and that everywhere where a Road Closure is required, it hasn’t happened.
- RS says Haringey and Camden have been installing Cycling invent by 15% last year
- And suggests Southwark should be trying this as an experiment.
- Cllr W states that everything Southwark does needs to go through a process so Southwark have to act in a precautionary manner. Cllr adds that everything we do needs to be challengeable.
- LQ says there is consultation out for the Southwark spine and adds that ‘we are proposing changes to the gyratory.’ LQ adds that ‘We are proposing to review the route. If we are going to change the layout of the road then we look at traffic volunteers.’
- MP states that people are more likely to understand the trend once the traffic is back to its normal flow.
- JL makes the points about spreadsheets being updated with the latest traffic cones.
- JLE says the issue with the mapping software is that it needs to be updated. There is a map
- It’s stated there are concerns for the safety of cyclists throughout the gyratory.
- It’s also stated that there are issues with the traffic closures.
- There are also concerns about junctions that are not possible for cyclists.
**Agenda Item 6 Southwark Cyclists issues with Peckham High Street to Lordship Lane section –**

Members of the CSG (Cycling Stakeholder Group) have set up an online action plan for staff who opposes the Southwark Spine and believe that there is a real risk of the highways authority neglecting design.

Members of CSG could support some of the raised tables for the scheme that had majority support.

AAT says that the Bellenden Gyratory was consulted on. A co design was done with key stakeholders complete with two options.

The current design that most people wanted at some time has been gone through.

This scheme has been road safety audited. Traffic volume is being monitored to see how this holistically works. Traffic modelling has been carried out and parallel routes has been proposed.

RS says that Southwark Cyclists were not involved in the Co Design and adds that there was a majority calling for the removal of the gyratory.

**Agenda Item 7:**

*Spine – Update on remainder of route; when, where, what proposals for traffic reduction are being mooted and what sorts of proactive community engagement by LBS on the issue will there be?*

Concerns about the spine are highlighted.

- Designs of the cycle route and the segregated lanes
- The spine is a rat run. You can drive the whole route.
- There are very unsafe parts of the route when they cross TfL main roads.

RS states that online action has been set up opposing this and calling for the previous design to be reinstated. RS says the design could be accused of being negligent.

AA states that he has done a co-design and come up with two options that were presented at a workshop.

The current design is the one that AA has developed, and making sure that it aligns with current standards.

AA states that the scheme has been road safety audited, but could look at specific issues again. AA will look at how it will interact with the area-wide changes.

Melon Road has been involved with TfL. There will be another co-design of [an area] so the spine won’t be finished there yet.

RS states ‘We would welcome a design meeting’. RS adds that the co-design was not well run and didn’t feel it was representative. RS felt Southwark Cyclists were not involved.
AA states there were lessons learned from the co-design.

RS adds that people doing different studies do not realise what is being planned in adjacent areas and different units.

AA says there is potential CPZ for the area North of Peckham High St and South of Burgess Park, along with co-design, early in the New Year

JLE states that Southwark is planning for the route from St George’s Circus to Burgess Park, knowing that Southwark are facing opposition from friends of Burgess Park. March initial funding, build in 2019

RS voices a concern that Southwark are proposing to close many homes while proposing new schemes where cycling is becoming more dangerous.

JLE says there is opposition from Friends of Burgess Park.

**Agenda Item 8:**

Consultation framing & area selection - how can consultation process be improved – Eleanor Margolies leads discussion.

EM enquires how Southwark designs consultations, and asks if Southwark are happy with the outcome of these consultations in relation to the strategies that they are supposed to deliver.

EM felt the Camberwell Grove, the council estates were excluded; and felt there could have been many people who use the road included.

A bid for the area-wide traffic management study was put in.

RS asked about out of area responses especially immediately proximate responses. RS says that consultations do not make it clear that the result is considered alongside responsibilities for public health, etc. RS adds that in the Spine consultation the tick box system is difficult to use.

Cllr W says that Southwark is here to take and act as an overview and to have responsibilities beyond the consultation response.

EE says that people do not understand that consultations are an opportunity to provide information; and states that people think it is a referendum. EE says that this is partially because the information provided with a consultation is unclear.

EM states that the question framed was to the East of Camberwell Grove but didn’t include sections of the community.

Cllr W says he wants to look forward listening to other lobbies to work with various groups.
**Agenda Item 9:**

**Salt treatment of cycle routes**

**Gritting**

TFL treat their Cycle Routes.

DF - We took the decision to investigate the treatment of Cycle Routes this year. TfL use a brine solution as opposed to the rock salt we use on carriageways. This would not be an appropriate treatment for cycle routes as it relies on traffic/wheel action. We looked at all the routes throughout the Borough. There are more than 33km of cycle routes in Southwark.

We are currently getting costs from our contractor.

The initial estimate of costs is £30,000, with an additional £1,00 every time we go out on a treatment run. We are making a commitment to treat cycle routes but can’t treat them all so asking the CSG.

We are currently getting costs from our contractor.

**Agenda Item 10:**

**LBS action on idling – further explanation wanted –Eleanor Margolies**

LBS action on idling. How will this happen?

MP says Civil Enforcement officers have been trained in how to engage with drivers to switch off or move on.

Training?

RS asked if the wardens could be given the powers to distribute notices

MP responds by saying this would require all the uniforms to change, and the wardens would need to undertake civil enforcement officer training.

JL: It is easier for Southwark’s own staff, but what is possible to ensure compliance by subcontractors?

Members of the CSG are happy to merge cyclists going Southbound and Northbound. The ASC’s to 7JM deep.

The new enforcement officers will be employed at the training for Southwark’s fleet drivers.

MP says Southwark has forty enforcement officers that work throughout the borough and with regards to the cost of a PCN; Councillors will have to lobby to change the price.
Cllr W states that Southwark have increased the price. It’s a change from the Penalty Charge. Cllr adds that there are higher penalties for going through (breaking the law driving) and that Southwark is expecting lower levels of PCN’s to be issued. The council is very aware of drivers idling.

EM suggests face to face contact to deal with idling drivers.

MP states that Southwark have issued PCN’s to parents who park on School Keep Clear signs and the PCN’s will be dealing with idling engines.

**Agenda Item 11**

**Pre-Driver Training**

Cllr W highlights recent presentation by the AA involving how people are trained in cycle awareness in relation to young driver training, and they are encouraging deputations.

There was a presentation from the AA who works with young drivers. The key elements of this are awareness of cyclists. There are constant details of the person working on this. You can come to them. They wish to extend the scheme to all boroughs in London.

Cllr W highlights recent presentation by the AA involving how people are trained in cycle awareness in relation to young driver training, and they are encouraging deputations.

**Agenda Item 12: Short Presentation on new inclusive cycling guide**

by Alex Ingram from Wheels For Wellbeing


Short Presentation on new inclusive cycling guide

AI provides copies, and PDF. It is supportive of various guidance.

Lack of consistency is one of the biggest issues for disabled mobility.

To see the PDF report, visit the W4W website – campaigns → publications – bottom of the page.

Reorganisation for disability cyclists.

Case Studies;

Policy recommendations.

IA says Wheels for Wellbeing sees the Guide as a Living Document and adds that there is more to say.
**Agenda Item 13. Update by Project Manager**

Joanna Lesak on Camberwell Grove bridge re-opening - implications for Champion Hill, Dog Kennel Hill, and Camberwell Grove section of Quietway and other projects

And also Peckham Rye to Dulwich and Harper Rd

Full designs have been made for open and shut bridge.

Full pedestrian crossing via extended central island. Larger ASL.

Consideration of signalised or non-signalised pedestrian crossing on Camberwell Grove and on McNeil Rd.

RS asks for additional evidence and timescale on the design

The decision will be taken soon and the design will hopefully be reviewed before Christmas.

Road Safety Audit will need to happen.

The Quietway will now go up Grace’s Mews. Turning onto CG there is no space for a physical island, there may be a ghost island.

Harper Rd – experimental width restriction. Around Brockham St. should also deter general traffic.

An online questionnaire will be active for the trial. Follow up traffic counts in September 2018.

Closure outside the Mosque and on Bath Terrace. Need to make sure that HGVs don’t divert down Cole St.

Spine will no longer go all the way down Harper Rd for the foreseeable future; ‘We want the junction to be improved by TfL’.

It will be cement blocks at the current width restrictions outside the Mosque. Traffic isn’t high enough for a point closure. Bath Terrace closure would be south of entrance to council estate.

The representations from Shopkeepers have been mostly anti-closure so far.

Joanna: Peckham Rye to Dulwich Quietway

JLE says there are feasibility issues around traffic saturation and impact of design on traffic and bus delays at the Lordship Lane and Barry Road junction.

Court Lane residents were very anti quietway 7.

Looking at alternative routes along Court Lane/Woodwarde Road.

Cllr W says he is getting complaints from the shopkeepers about dropping trade. Anything one can do about that would be useful.

**14. Any Other Business**

We ran out of time at this point for JL to make his point for feedback.