File Note

Cycling Forum Meeting to Discuss the HoH Proposals

Meeting on 2 May 2013

Item	Discussions Points	Any Action To be Taken
1.	SB set the context and introduced the scheme. She indicated that a number of 'go-early' consultations were being held with key stakeholders over and above the general public consultation events.	None
2.	There was a general discussion about meeting the different needs of different cyclists – confident cyclists and young people or those less confident.	None
	In this context there was discussion about the desire for dedicated cycle lanes through the junction.	
	SB explained that in an ideal world there would be space to meet all users' requirements but that following strong feedback from the community the scheme has been designed to reduce traffic speed and provide space for pedestrians. In addition, the scheme needs to support local businesses and the traders had emphasised the need for stop and shop parking. Consequently, a decision had been made not to include dedicated cycle lanes.	
	There was a good debate about the need for a dedicated cycle lane but on balance, and in view of the fact that the scheme will reduce vehicle speeds, the conclusion was that this should not be necessary.	
	There was also a debate about relative priority between cyclists and pedestrians. In principle, and on balance after a good deal of discussion, the Group (including the rep from Living Streets) indicated that they understood the concept of the proposed scheme.	
	There was also some discussion about the problems of segregated cycle lanes as often these are not cleaned/maintained and dirt etc can lead to more punctures.	
3.	The Forum expressed disappointment at the amount of car parking proposed.	Parking Strategy to be consulted on
	SB explained that retailers had been very specific about the need for as many stop and shop parking bays. The council understood that some of the existing bays were blocked by commuters and following a survey of parking in the area had prepared a parking strategy and	

	producing a plan for more parking controls. There would be consultation over this.	
4.	The Forum thought it might be better to replace the car parking proposed outside of the post office with cycle parking for a number of reasons. Firstly, they thought that car parking on this corner would be dangerous/difficult. Secondly, they think that more cycle parking should be provided and noticed that there are few locations possible given the amount of car parking. Finally they wondered if, by removing the car parking from this location, you would be able to shift the bus lay by further westwards which would allow for another crossing point between Centrale and the Post Office. They pointed out that this is likely to be a strong desire line for pedestrians.	Design Team to investigate
5.	In addition there was concern that the bus stop would, in any event, be too close to the junction.	Design Team to investigate
6.	The Forum would like the No Entry Signs on Elm Road to be changed to say 'No Entry Except for Cyclists' and for a contra flow cycling lane to help those less confident cyclists navigate the scheme.	AF/SB/Design Team to investigate
7.	The access roads to Mile Road and the entrance to Soho Mills do not appear to have been designed to give priority to pedestrians in the same way that other entrances have.	Design Team to investigate
8.	There is a really strong desire for a boulevard concept for the whole of London Road from the point at which it enters the Borough. It was felt that the street trees would help signify that the area is 'different'. How many street trees are proposed/how far north do they go/can there be more?	The number of street trees in scope of the project will be reviewed along with their scale. Unfortunately trees along the boulevard are not within scope and cannot be met within the budget.
9.	Is there any possibility for permanent lighting in the street trees (this has been done on a scheme in Woolwich and the Group liked the concept)?	Design Team to investigate