
Confidential Minutes

Agenda item:11
Drafted: 09.05.17

Confidential minutes of the Board meeting held on 11 April 2017 at Union Street

These minutes are in addition to the public minutes of a meeting of the Board on the same date. The Board resolved, under section 15(2)(b) of schedule 18 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999, that by reason of the confidential nature of the item(s) to be discussed, it was desirable in the public interest that the public should be excluded for this part of the meeting.

Contents

1. Minutes and declarations of interest
2. Cycling in London (LTW550)
3. Meeting review

Present

Members

Jackie Ballard, Alan Benson, Richard Dilks, Glyn Kyle, Stephen Locke (Chair), Abdi Osman, John Stewart

Secretariat

Tim Bellenger	Director, Policy and Investigation
Janet Cooke	Chief Executive
Richard Freeston-Clough	Communications Officer
Sharon Malley	Executive Assistant
Vincent Stops	Policy Officer

1 Minutes and declarations of interest

The confidential minutes of the meeting on 31 January 2017 were agreed, subject to the deletion of “and” in line 29 of page 3 and the insertion of a full stop after “doors” in the same line.

Alan Benson declared an interest in respect of item 2 as he was Chair of Transport for All but he did not think this interest prevented him from participating in the item.

2 Cycling in London (LTW550)

The Policy Officer (VS) presented a draft report on cycling in London and the best way to promote and enable more cycling in London.

He said that London TravelWatch had long supported the aspiration to increase the volume of cycling in London. Its historical approach had been to support cycling on the main carriageway, although some cyclists called instead for dedicated road space and signal time. He noted that provision of such facilities solely for cyclists

often led to reduced provision for buses and pedestrians, which could be problematic. London TravelWatch had a duty to balance the needs of all transport users. Separation of cycles may be appropriate on higher speed roads but less so congested central areas. Each cycle infrastructure proposal should be treated on its own merits.

The Policy Officer (VS) said that cycling was becoming safer per mile travelled, as was road use generally. London TravelWatch supported initiatives to increase cycling as part of integrated journeys, such as secure cycle parking at stations in outer London.

Members noted that the structure of the report would benefit from review and that London TravelWatch's aspirations for cycling should be clearer. There was some concern that the statements on cycle segregation did not reflect London TravelWatch's position and that London TravelWatch should avoid a blanket position about the suitability of segregation on particular types of road. The report should emphasise what has and has not worked for cyclists in the past. It should reduce the emphasis on international comparisons as they were not on a similar scale to London; comparisons with New York or Paris would be more relevant if they were available.

The Policy Officer (VS) said that some high streets were so busy that it was very difficult to integrate cycle activity with other uses. It was agreed that all streets had their own characteristics and potential for conflict, with the busiest streets often presenting the greatest likelihood of conflict. Junction design was very important and some of the new Cycle Super Highway junctions had not been handled well.

Members said they would like to see a more neutral assessment of Cycle Super Highways in the report. There was little positive comment about them in the document and this was problematic. Some members also said that the assessment of where dedicated cycle lanes on high streets were appropriate should be more neutral.

Members noted that the report was intended to be supportive of cycling and should focus more clearly on what worked for cyclists rather than on the downsides for other users. It was appropriate to emphasise the need to make choices and balance a variety of needs, but the report should start more clearly from a position of wanting to support cycling as part of London's mix of transport modes.

Members said that the new generation of Cycle Super Highways were generally separate from bus stops and they should be addressed in the report. It was important not to lose sight of the benefits that cycling provision could offer and to recognise the aim of attracting new cyclists in London.

The Director, Policy and Investigation, recognised that London TravelWatch's current position required some difficult trade-offs, as it was supportive of cycling and aimed to increase levels of cycling but was concerned about potential conflicts between cyclists and other vulnerable road users. He wanted to develop criteria for the assessment of individual schemes so that it would be possible to measure the benefits of proposals as they emerged.

It was agreed that the Policy Officer (VS) would review the report in light of the comments from members and circulate it again once amended.

3 Meeting review

It was agreed that the meeting had been useful and that there had not been any need on this occasion for external speakers. There had been a good mix of modes under discussion during the meeting. No reputational risks or media issues were identified.