Councillor Beacham, Mallett (Chair), Santry and Weber

S

Observer Councillor Guest Inattendance Short List

Apologies Councillor

#### LC22. APOLOGIES

Apologies received from Paul Bumstead & Adam Coffman.

#### LC23. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

It was noted that Cllr Mallett was a member of the London Cycling Campaign and Cllr Beacham worked for Transport for London. Neither member felt that these declared interests would be prejudicial to the review.

#### LC24. LATE ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None received.

#### LC25. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

These were approved.

### Matters arising

It was requested that the evaluation of Stop and Shop (which has been running in both Crouch End and Muswell Hill) should be presented to the panel when available.

**Agreed:** The results of Stop and Shop to be presented at the next meeting (15<sup>th</sup> December 2009).

The panel noted that the Sustainable Transport service will present a report at the next meeting where it is anticipated that representatives from the School Travel team will be in attendance.

In relation to the maintenance of footways and highways, the panel were unclear about the reporting process (and subsequent repair) for Homes for Haringey managed surfaces. It was reported that at present Homes for Haringey operate their own reporting and maintenance system, separate from Haringey Council.

The panel felt that this was an unsatisfactory arrangement as it would not be obvious to pedestrians, cyclists or other pavement/highway users which parts of the network were managed by Homes for Haringey and those by Haringey Council. The panel felt that this would make it problematic for residents and road/pavement users to report repairs appropriately.

**Agreed:** The panel indicated that a recommendation would be considered in relation to the maintenance and repair of footways and highways for those parts of the network managed by Homes for Haringey.

The panel further discussed the selection of situating of car club bays. Currently, car clubs were placed in areas with good transport links to ensure connectivity of different modes. The panel felt however, that car club spaces should also be situated in areas where public transport was poor to extend people's travel choices. The panel felt that this was important to help address local inequalities.

**Agreed:** That the selection of sites for car club spaces should include those areas of the borough where public transport links are currently under developed.

#### LC26. TRANSPORT FOR LONDON

David Rowe (Head of Core Programmes, Smarter Travel Unit at Transport for London) gave a presentation to the panel. Highlights of the main points raised in this presentation are summarised below.

The new Mayors Transport Strategy highlighted a number of themes to improve transport provision including increasing capacity, changed land use and demand management. Whilst the former is exclusively the responsibility of Transport for London (TfL), changed land use (planning) and demand management were identified to be the responsibility of both Local Authorities and TfL and where local work should be focussed.

The development of the sustainable transport message borrows from other social marketing campaigns from other sectors such as the need to conserve water, to reduce energy consumption and numerous public health campaigns. Such social marketing techniques are both politically acceptable and cost effective.

Developing sustainable travel initiatives such as travel plans and individual travel marketing should be focussed on those organisations or events where there is the largest travel footprint such as large companies, colleges, schools and large entertainment venues. Targeting these organisations is most cost effective way in delivering successful sustainable transport programmes.

Work based travel planning is particularly important as 1/3 of all travel trips undertaken are work related. It should be noted that a reduction in operating costs will be a prime motivator for businesses to become involved in work based travel planning and this should frame engagement and subsequent sustainable travel initiatives.

Trip indicators underline the drop in the level of walking and cycling the further journeys start from the centre of London. This is understandable given the density of the travel network in central and inner London. What this does indicate however, is that there is a need to focus on delivering initiatives which encourage walking and cycling in outer London areas. This would be pertinent to Haringey being on the border of inner/outer London borough.

Schools and colleges are also significant trip generators and therefore an important target for dedicated travel planning (school travel plans). It was noted that Haringey

has performed well in this areas where all schools have a travel plan and uptake is well above national targets. In particular, Moselle School was often highlighted as exemplar. The panel noted (in relation to previous discussions) that there are better rewards for schools that continue with the school travel plan (British Gas Green Leaves) where schools can receive rewards for continuing engagement (i.e. a PC). It was noted that some local schools are continuing (i.e. Moselle).

Car clubs have seen a rapid growth across London where there are approxianmItey 1,600 vehicles and 89,000 members across 23 boroughs. Car club audits have shown real benefits for sustainable transport as it is estimated that 20% of members will sell their car and an even higher proportion will decide not to buy a new vehicle as a result of joining a car club. Having the option of using the car club makes people think about transport options rather than instinctively grabbing for the car keys at the start of a journey.

There are a number of schemes (in Camden and Islington) where there have been follow up car club initiatives where sustainable transport benefits are 'locked in'. These have included giving the released parking space over for other public amenity or (creating mini- CPZ) and taking away parking permit rights (indefinitely) for that household. Further details to be followed up with TfL.

A number of questions were raised by the panel in respect of developing wider access to car clubs, particularly among the disabled and within those communities where discussed there is a high level of social deprivation. TfL reported that whilst it was not aware of any car club schemes that allowed for disabled access, Greenwich had run a very successful car club based in areas of social deprivation: 3 cars based on a local housing had the highest usage in the borough.

The panel noted that whilst car club spaces were now being considered as part of planning processes, it was felt that there should be further efforts to ensure that there was sufficient attention paid (and provision) to providing for car club bays in new development planning applications.

Other smarter travel programmes have been established in London, namely in Sutton and Richmond. These have been supported by TfL working in partnership with the boroughs. It was noted that the panel would be visiting Sutton as part of the review, it was recommended that the panel look at the continuation of Smarter Travel Sutton after its 3 year operation to see how the programmes had been embedded and the links that were established with partners, particularly the PCT within its Active Steps Programme.

Less money was available to Richmond and this authority sought to develop infrastructure (i.e. cycle lanes) before the launch of softer measures (i.e. travel information). The borough also sought to segment the population, to ensure effective targeting within travel marketing (i.e. ensuring that sustainable travel programmes focused on those motivated for change).

The panel heard that Merton borough council experienced a particular problem with schoolchildren congregating around Wimbledon town centre before and after school. The large numbers of young people waiting for buses precipitated a lot of low level anti-social behaviour, bus delays and problems for other bus passengers. TfL and Merton worked together to encourage young people to walk to and from station using

a variety of incentive schemes (i.e. walking check in points) which produced a 45% increase in the level of walking an helped to ease congestion in the town centre.

The panel noted that the planned Cycle Superhighways (as specified in the Mayors Transport Strategy) would come through Haringey: route 1 running through the east of the borough (Tottenham to Liverpool Street) and route 12 running through the west of the borough (East Finchley to Angel. It was suggested that forward planning needs to take place within the borough to develop access to these main arterial routes so that the local cycle network complements these new routes.

The timing of the implementation of the Cycle Superhighways was questioned as delays have been reported to be expected. TfL noted that 2 routes within the Cycle Superhighways programme would be in place by the summer of 2010, though these will not be to the full specification (these will be developed over time). Nonetheless, these routes were felt to represent a significant advance.

The panel noted that the biking borough initiative will commence in 2010. The Mayor will be looking to designate several outer London Boroughs as 'Biking Boroughs' (formerly known as 'hubs'). These Boroughs would demonstrate an enhanced commitment to cycling as evidenced through their cycle plans/strategies. This initiative will provide some initial funding and support (data analysis) for qualifying boroughs. Invitation letters are being sent out to London boroughs in December outlining participation criteria.

**Note:** Once criteria are known, clarification of Haringey's position may be sought regarding an application for biking borough status?

In relation to the biking borough status, the panel noted that this was being targeted at outer London boroughs. The panel sought to clarify whether Haringey would qualify as there were moves to try and get the borough reclassified as inner London for the purpose of education funding. It was noted that such moves would not impact on Haringey's eligibility.

In Haringey, it was noted that there is a workplace officer, but this role is shared with a number of North central London authorities. This work is done through an enterprise company and thus most work is performed 'at arms length'. From April 2010, it is anticipated that this role will be developed to focus more on outer London boroughs in the group (Haringey included).

The panel noted that Personal Travel Planning was not included within the presentation. It was recorded that this is not as cost effective as work which targets high trip generating organisations such as large companies, schools or colleges. From a Haringey perspective, it was noted that the personal travel marketing approach would be included in the Muswell Hill low carbon zone project, though the individual travel marketing process would be accompanied by other information (i.e. recycling, reducing energy consumption.

It was noted that underlying economic development and an increasing population growth will create further demand for transport across London. It was the intention of TfL to reduce the number of trips that people make however, as this was far more cost effective than increasing capacity on the transport network.

The panel sought to clarify if there was a template for engaging with local partners and local businesses. It was noted that TfL offer a model of support based upon a standardised audit process which assess barriers to sustainable transport use and opportunities for developing access/ uptake of sustainable transport within an organisation. This model can be used to predict outcomes (i.e. modal shift) and guide which interventions will be most effective.

The panel noted that the Metropolitan HGV safety unit has been disbanded as this was not a cost effective service. Officers from TfL are now providing this service.

The panel questioned whether travel planning principle could be applied to hospitals, as these generated a significant amount of trips (especially in Haringey as there were no hospitals located in the borough). TfL reported on the experience of Princes Royal hospital which was lobbying for a route change on a local bus service. Through developing land on the hospital site, pedestrian access to bus routes was improved (9%) and this was a significantly cheaper option than the cost of changing a bus route (£1/4m each year plus inconvenience to other bus route users). It was noted that TfL had raised the redevelopment North Middlesex with NHS London for similar consideration.

#### LC27. JOANNE MCCARTNEY (GLA)

Joanne McCartney gave a presentation to the panel. Ms McCartney is a member of the Greater London Assembly (Enfield & Haringey) and the rapporteur for the transport committee investigating cycle stand provision across London.

The transport committee operates as a scrutiny function, and therefore has a role in holding the mayor to account and in policy development. The committee has undertaken a number of reviews in the past 2 years including 20mph speed limits and Home Zones, upgrading the underground, performance of dial-a-ride and traffic congestion.

The committee has also recently completed an investigation in to the provision of cycle parking across the capital. The panel noted that there has been a big upsurge in cycling across the capital; the proportion of trips undertaken by bike has increased by more than 100% in the past 10 years. The availability of safe, secure and appropriately located cycle parking however, remains a significant barrier to potential cyclists. The following is a summary of the main points from the presentation and subsequent panel discussions.

The scale of the challenge facing authorities aiming to improve cycling provision was underlined to the panel, these being:

- 18,000 bicycles are reported stolen each year, yet only ¼ of bike thefts are reported which would suggest well in excess of 70,000 bikes are stolen each year.
- An audit of cycle parking undertaken by the GLA found that a majority (71%) of respondents indicated that cycle parking in the capital was poor.
- The planned 53,000 additional cycle stands planned by the Mayors (past and present) is probably insufficient; London Cycling Campaign indicate that a further 100,000 spaces are probably needed.

The investigation by the transport committee in to bike stand provision came to a number of significant conclusions and recommendations:

- There is currently no overarching strategy in place for the development of cycle parking in London.
- There needs to be more work to develop minimum standards for cycle stand design, security and location.
- There is more local freedom within the LIP funding process to prioritise local schemes, such as cycle parking.
- Closer examination of the land available at main transport nodes (mainline stations and tube station) for the development of cycle parking should be undertaken.
- Local ward audits should be undertaken to assess the scale and location of cycle stand provision few authorities have a record of where cycle stands are currently placed. (It was noted that Wandsworth have undertaken ward audits to help build a database of cycle stands). This process is vital to help plan appropriate cycle stand provision.

There were a number of ways in which the provision of cycle stands could be developed in Haringey, these were identified as:

- Haringey as a major local employer should set an example to others in the locality by ensuring that it provides a full range of cycle facilities (parking, showers, lockers and cycling mileage allowance).
- Retro fitting of cycle stands in the boroughs housing estates (such as bike lockers).
- Carefully consider the impact of policies which remove street clutter as these may inadvertently remove informal cycle parking (i.e. railings).
- As a planning authority, Haringey has a big influence on sustainable transport provision such as through the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) and the Core Strategy. Cycling provision should be included within this key strategy.
- Haringey may also influence sustainable transport provision through S106 and planning gain particularly in relation to Haringey Heartlands and the Spurs football ground redevelopment. The Council should be sure to avoid the situation concerning the redevelopment of the Arsenal football ground where only 60 cycle spaces were provided for a stadium seating over 60,000 people.
- Haringey should also develop a database of where cycle stands are currently located, the type of stands provides and where stands are needed.
- Most importantly however, is that the Council should utilise established partnerships to develop an integrated response to sustainable transport (and cycle stands in particular). The council is the key link and important player in setting the local sustainable transport agenda.
- It was also noted that the scrutiny review will be in a good position to influence the drafting of the Local Implementation Plan which will set out local transport policies in the medium term.

The panel was concerned about the provision of cycle storage in social housing. Currently there are issues for units run by Homes for Haringey (ALMO) where bikes and even motor bikes have been stored on the landings of properties which present obvious health & safety risks (i.e. access and fire). It was noted that the ALMO did not have any current allocation to resource such developments. The panel heard that the Council is currently operating three trials of cycle park schemes.

**Agreed:** Further details of the trials to come to the panel.

The panel was made aware that there were a number of TfL funded projects to improve cycle parking on housing estates. It was noted that further information could be provided on request.

**Agreed:** To follow up with Transport for London.

The panel also wish to seek clarification as to whether there were any dedicated allocations or scope to include cycle storage within Decent Homes funding? Contact would be made with Homes for Haringey to ascertain whether such funding was available.

**Agreed:** To follow up with Homes for Haringey.

The panel noted that in Germany, every new flat is allocated a cycle parking space. This raised a number of questions for the panel in terms of new development and cycle parking, namely, what minimum standards are there for cycle park development and what should the allocation be per unit?

It was reported to the panel that there are guidelines for the allocation of 1.5 cycle parking spaces for each unit of development (to recognise that there may be family units which require additional provision). It was also reported that some local authorities (i.e. Waltham Forest) have already set local minimum standards for cycle development and that Haringey were in a position to establish a similar standard.

The panel noted that the quality and location of cycle parking varied. Butterfly parking stands were noted to be useless as these did not provide any security (as you can only lock your wheel rather than the frame in the stand). The preference is for Sheffield stands.

The orientation of bike stands was also noted to be important not just for those cyclists wishing to access them to secure their bike but also to pedestrian flows around the bike stands. This should be noted in local planning and design.

**Agreed:** To ascertain what is currently specified within the local cycling strategy and whether local minimum standards for cycle stands provision can be developed in relation to design and location and for planning guidance.

The panel noted that a number of new cycle stands had appeared across the borough and wished to clarify what consultation processes had been employed in deciding where these should be situated. It was recorded that Haringey Cycling Campaign (HCC) is consulted in such developments and that over 40 locations for stands have been suggested by the organisation. HCC have been consulted on design (against stainless steel hoop) and met with conservation officers to decide how best to place cycle parking in such areas.

The panel were keen on the idea of cycle parking audits in local wards as this would provide the authority with baseline data. This would help to identify what is already provided and gaps in current provision as well as acting as a guide to inform future development.

**Agreed:** That the panel seek further information about ward audits and consider a recommendation in respect of developing this proposal for cycle parking.

#### LC28. SUSTRANS

Sustrans is a civil engineering charity which has been running for over 30 years. Matt Winfield, Greenways Manager for Sustrans provided a presentation to the panel. An outline of the main sustainable transport project was provided to the panel namely, TravelSmart, Bike It, DIY Streets and Greenways for the London Olympics (GOAL). A summary of the main points of the presentation and subsequent panel discussions are provided below.

TravelSmart was introduced to the UK in 2001 from the continent. This approach is based on Individual Travel Marketing, which target particular segments of a population who may be most likely to change their travel behaviour. This approach has been successfully employed in some of the sustainable travel demonstration towns (i.e. Peterborough). The approach aims to save time and money of participants as well as improve their health and well being (via active travel methods).

TravelSmart has been fully evaluated (through SocialData) and has been shown to improve uptake of walking and cycling as well as decrease the reliance on the private car for travel. For example, in Peterborough walking trips were increased by 9%, cycling trips by 36% and car usage reduced by 11%. Similar results have been seen in Watford, Worcester and Doncaster. Of interest to the panel was that Sustrans are working with the Oceans Estate in Tower Hamlets and is aiming for a 10% increase in sustainable transport.

'Bike It' is a cycle promotion project focussed on primary schools. This project has worked in 4 primary schools in Haringey including Devonshire Hill, Weston Park, Chestnuts & Seven Sisters. Regular cycling at these schools rose to between 11-14% (from 2-3%). There is a plan to expand this project to secondary schools and colleges.

The Panel were interested to hear about DIY Streets. DIY Streets helps residents to re-design their own streets affordably, putting people at their heart, and making them safer and more attractive places to live. The project works with local communities to help residents develop low-cost capital solutions to making their streets safer and more attractive, aiming to find simple interventions and materials which can be both effective and durable. These have an approximate £20k budget per annum.

The Panel noted that the Council had signed up with Sustrans for a DIY Streets project here in Haringey. It was planned to develop a DIY Streets project around collection of 6 or 7 streets in the borough (implementation 2011), though the actual location could not be confirmed until the local residents association had formally agreed to support it and participate in the programme. If the residents association did not support it, all local residents associations would be invited. The panel requested further information about this project when available.

**Agreed:** Further information on the DIY Streets project to be provided to the panel when this becomes available.

Home Zones are an attempt to strike a balance between vehicular traffic and everyone else who uses the street, the pedestrians, cyclists, business people and

residents. Home Zones work through the physical alteration of streets and roads in an area. These alterations force motorists to drive with greater care and at lower speeds.

The panel also noted that there have been a number of Home Zones developed in the borough and whilst these had brought some improvement, there were ongoing problems: there was continuing conflict between different street users, there needed to be continuing engagement and education for new people coming on to the street and the need to involve people beyond just 'active residents'.

The panel heard about the development of Greenways. The aim of greenways are not just about getting from A to B (by bike or foot), but about creating a positive travel environment which people will want to use and encourage new cyclists and walkers. Greenways are safe, pleasant routes running through parks, forests, waterways and quiet residential streets. In this context, they are good for people who are new to cycling who want to build confidence on their bike. The network of greenways aims to compliment other cycle routes i.e. London Cycle Network.

It was noted that the Lordship Recreation Regeneration is being used to develop greenways in the borough. Parkland Walk is also a good example of a greenway in London. It was reported to the panel that it was hoped that greenways would be adopted in the Local Development Framework (LDF) and the core strategy of London boroughs.

The panel raised the issue of how residents are able to find out about local cycle networks such as the LCN and greenways. It was reported that there are a wide range of maps which are produced by TfL and available through their website. The panel felt that there should be more localised information targeted at local residents.

**Agreed:** The panel noted that there was a walking, cycling and jogging officer based in the recreation service who may be able to play a role in promoting the local cycle network to residents, schools and colleges. This may be considered as a recommendation by the panel.

The panel also noted that they were only aware of one cycle hire organisation within the borough. As far as the panel could recall the only scheme was in the Lea Valley complex. It was suggested that further schemes, possibly linked to greenways may encourage greater uptake of cycling, particularly families where perhaps parents do not have bikes.

The panel heard that cycle permeability was a key factor in developing cycle access as this provided safer more direct routes for cyclists. It was noted that the development of one way streets was becoming a common approach which but which failed to recognise the needs of the cyclists (i.e. Tottenham gyratory). The panel heard that further consultation may be needed to ensure the permeability of streets in Haringey.

#### LC29. GREENEST BOROUGH STRATEGY (PERFORMANCE REPORT)

This item was deferred until the next meeting.

#### LC30. LATE ITEMS

None.

### LC31. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

15<sup>th</sup> December 2009 6.30pm at Haringey Civic Centre.

### **Clir George Meehan**

Chair