

Scrutiny Review: Cycling

A Review by the Environment and Community Scrutiny Panel

2015/16

Panel Membership	Cllr Adam Jogee (Chair)
	Cllr Pat Berryman
	Cllr John Bevan
	Cllr Barbara Blake
	Cllr Sarah Elliott
	Cllr Bob Hare
	Cllr Sheila Peacock
	Mr I Sygrave (Co-opted Member)

Lead Officer: Robert Mack, Principal Scrutiny Support Officer
Rob.mack@haringey.gov.uk
0208 489 2921

Contents:	page
Chairs Foreword	4.
Recommendations	5.
Background	7.
Introduction	9.
Action to Increase Cycling	12.
Haringey's Strategic Approach	15.
Developing Haringey's Cycling Infrastructure	18.
Cycle Parking and Security	22.
Promoting Behaviour Change	24.
Case Studies; Cambridge and Waltham Forest	26.
Appendix A; Participants in the Review	28.

CHAIR'S FOREWORD

The wide remit of the Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel is such that we could have chosen any one of very many topics to look into over the past year.

We chose an area that would not only fall under remit but was relevant to the Council's aim of building a happier and healthier Haringey.

Cycling can often be viewed as a niche issue for our families and communities but it is, in many ways, a debate about the sort of streets that we want and the neighbourhoods we live in.

Cycling can play a significant part in making our streets clean, welcoming, safe and healthy places. There have been massive increases in cycling in London over recent years but there is still huge untapped potential for further increases in bike use in the suburbs. Realising this potential could mean fewer cars, less congestion, cleaner air and a more active population so the benefits may very well be considerable.

There is significant work being undertaken to regenerate parts of Haringey, especially in Tottenham and the east of the borough, and this should provide particular opportunities to develop further the cycling infrastructure across the borough.

There is an element of truth in the stereotypical view of cyclists being “middle aged men in lycra” but this is only because cycling is still viewed by many as being just for the quick and brave. In order to increase cycling significantly, it needs to become viewed as a normal activity undertaken by a wide range of people in terms of age, gender, class, economic background and ethnicity.

This means people cycling to meetings in their work clothes, to the shops, to meet friends and to travel to school. Before this can happen, people need to feel secure and able on their bikes and safe spaces for them need to be created. There is clear evidence from elsewhere that once people feel safe, they will cycle and in large numbers too.

Proposed improvements to the cycling infrastructure elsewhere have not always met with universal approval though and at times have been more than controversial. The evidence is that they often have the support of the majority of people though and in many cases are frequently viewed as improvements to streets where the various infrastructure works have been implemented. However, it is clear that these works require strong political commitment to see them through.

The committee and I believe that Overview and Scrutiny can play a very useful role in this process because of its bi-partisan make up and its focus on consensus led results.

This review is intended to complement and support the work that is being done by

the Council, its partners and recognises that making cycling a more frequent and accessible part of life in Haringey is a long term objective. The Dutch cycling infrastructure was not created overnight and it would therefore be realistic to view improvements as being incremental.

Most other local authorities are also taking action to increase the use of cycling as a mode of transport and we have tapped into some of their experience in our review so we can hopefully benefit from emulating some of the things that have worked well elsewhere.

We have worked hard to ensure that all relevant stakeholders have been included and received input from Haringey Cycling Campaign, schools and areas, including Cambridge and Waltham Forest.

I am grateful to the Panel, Councillor Toni Mallett, the Council Cycling Champion, and Councillor Stuart McNamara, the former Cabinet Member for Environment.

I hope that our recommendations can make a useful contribution to further developing cycling in Haringey



Councillor Adam Jogee
Chair

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Haringey's Strategic Approach

1. That, as part of the forthcoming Cycling and Walking Strategy, a transformational vision for cycling be developed by the Council for the borough **and promoted as part of a wider "Living Streets" strategy, encompassing both walking and cycling** and backed up with strong and committed political will. *(Paragraph 4.6)*
2. That the overriding priority of the cycling content of the Council's forthcoming Cycling and Walking Strategy be to create a high quality cycle network that is, as far as possible, segregated from road traffic where speed differences between cycles and motor vehicles are large or where traffic volume is heavy. *(4.8)*
3. That, in order to promote and develop cycling in the borough further, a dedicated post of cycling officer be created, with an overarching responsibility for all aspects of the development of cycling within the borough. *(4.9)*
4. That quarterly meetings regarding cycling issues be scheduled between relevant officers, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Haringey Cycling Campaign and linked into meetings of the Transport Forum. *(4.10)*
5. That the structure of the Transport Forum be reviewed so that it encourages wider involvement of the community, particularly pedestrians and cyclists. *(4.10)*

Developing Haringey's Cycling Infrastructure

6. That the long term cycle route network for the borough and priorities within this be clearly publicised within the new Cycling and Walking strategy. *(5.7)*
7. That the long term cycle route network includes provision for a specific east-west route that crosses the borough. *(5.7)*
8. That cycle infrastructure projects be piloted in the first instance wherever possible in order to provide the necessary flexibility to amend them if necessary so that concerns raised by of residents may be responded to effectively. *(5.8)*
9. That the Council's Regeneration, Planning and Development Service undertake a review of cycle pinch points to ensure that these do not compromise the safety of cyclists. *(5.13)*
10. That the Cabinet Member for Environment be requested to confirm that the **Council's policy remains** that that parking on corners is prohibited and, if so, that it is enforced. *(5.13)*
11. That action be taken by the Regeneration, Planning and Development Service to increase the number of exemptions for cyclists from one way restrictions and

that these be signposted clearly and trialled in the first instance in order to ensure that they do not compromise the safety of pedestrians. (5.15)

12. That the Regeneration, Planning and Development Service be requested to;
 - (a). Commission a review of cycle paths within the borough where there is shared use with pedestrians; and
 - (b). Investigate methods of slowing cycles and deterring motorcycles and scooters which do not impact on cyclists using trailers, child tag-alongs and cargo cycles. (5.17)
13. That an annual cycle ride around the cycling infrastructure be undertaken by relevant officers with representatives of Haringey Cycling Campaign and interested Councillors to determine any issues relating to it that require attention, particularly signage and repairs. (5.18)

Cycle Parking and Security

14. That strong support be given to a major expansion by the Council, working with Transport for London, of the amount of secure cycle parking, such as bike hangars. (6.3)
15. That the Environment and Community Safety Service install additional bike racks where genuine demand can be demonstrated. (6.3)
16. That a feasibility study should be undertaken to see if secure and contained cycle parking facilities, similar to that provided by cycle hubs in Waltham Forest and part financed by a charge to users, could be established in Haringey. (6.4)
17. That clarification be provided on the procedure and responsibility for the removal of abandoned bicycle parts from cycle parking facilities and the timescale involved and that specific action be taken to speed up this process. (6.10)

Promoting Behaviour Change

18. That Haringey Cycling Conference be made into a bi-annual event but with a **wider focus, including walking and “living streets” initiatives.** (7.4)
19. That a Haringey Cycling Charter for schools should be developed as a way of building and extending the work that had been undertaken by North Harringay School and that this include cycle training and facilities. (7.8)
20. That further efforts be made to engage with secondary schools within the borough and include them in cycle training provided as part of the Smarter Travel programme. (7.9)

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Panel decided to commission a review focussing on increasing the use of cycling as a mode of transport as it is one of the Council's key priorities within the Corporate Plan for 2015-18. Objective 3 within Priority 3 of this states: **"We will make Haringey one of the most cycling and pedestrian friendly boroughs in London"**.
- 1.2 The Council's role is stated as being to promote cycling and walking by introducing a 20 mph speed limit, increasing dedicated cycle lanes and encouraging sustainable forms of transport through a smarter travel campaign.

Terms of Reference/Objectives

- 1.3 The terms of reference for the review were as follows:

"To consider how and make recommendations on how the Council can develop further its strategy on for increasing the use of cycling for travel and, in particular:

- The targeting of investment in the cycling infrastructure in order to achieve maximum benefit;
- How can the Council maximise the take up of cycling;
- The balance between work to develop the cycling infrastructure and encouraging behaviour change;
- Successful initiatives undertaken by other local authorities and especially other London boroughs; and
- **To what extent cycling can help address the borough's regeneration and growth agenda."**

Sources of Evidence:

- 1.4 Sources of evidence were:

- Research documentation and relevant local and national guidance;
- Interviews with key stakeholders and local organisations; and
- Visits to and investigation of practice in other local authority areas, including Cambridge and Waltham Forest.

- 1.5 A full list of all those who provided evidence is attached as Appendix A.

Membership

- 1.6 The membership of the Panel was as follows:

Councillors: Adam Jogee (Chair), Pat Berryman, John Bevan, Barbara Blake,

Sarah Elliott, Bob Hare and Sheila Peacock

Co-opted Member: Mr I Sygrave (Haringey Association of Neighbourhood Watches)

2 INTRODUCTION

Growth in Cycling

- 2.1 Cycling is now being used as a mode of transport by a rapidly increasing number of people in London. Between 2008 and 2014, there was a 33% **increase in the number of cyclists on London's roads and growth in 2010 alone was 10.3%.** A recent report from the Mayor's office revealed that in Zone 1, 32% of all vehicles on the roads are now bicycles during the morning rush hour. On some main roads, up to 70 per cent of vehicles are bicycles and in three years time it is estimated that the number of people commuting to central London by bike will overtake the number commuting by car.
- 2.2 This London wide growth has been reflected in Haringey, which saw an increase in volume of 73% between 2001 and 2012. 3% of trips are now made by bicycle within Haringey. This compares well to the London average of 2.7% and is above the level of most other suburban boroughs. 8% of Haringey residents are regular cyclists, **whilst 14% are "occasional" or "irregular".** **49% of residents** nevertheless have access to a bike, compared to a figure of 35% for London as a whole. It is also of significance that car ownership across London is declining and only 46% of Haringey residents currently have access to a car.
- 2.3 Whilst the figures for the increase in cycling are impressive, there is still considerable potential for improvement. Pan London statistics do not reflect the position in a large number of London boroughs and particularly outer London as they are distorted by comparatively high levels in a few inner London boroughs, such as Hackney, Lambeth and Southwark. 97% of trips in Haringey are currently not by bicycle and 71% of residents never cycle. A Transport for London report in 2010 illustrated the scope for improvement and estimated that about 37% of trips in Haringey were potentially cyclable. These were journeys which it was considered could reasonably be cycled all the way. Only about 6% of these potential cycle trips were being realised.
- 2.4 Another key issue is that the demography of those people who cycle does not reflect the **diversity of London's population**;
- 66% are male;
 - 67% are white and 28% from black and minority ethnic communities (BAME); and
 - 51% are from social class AB.
- 2.5 There is therefore an element of truth in the stereotypical image of cyclists being middle aged, middle class, white men as they are over-represented amongst them. In order to increase the number of trips made by bicycle, it will be necessary to increase the number of cyclists from under-represented groups such as women, BAME communities, older people and children. However, there is some evidence that the demographic is starting to change especially in respect of BAME communities.

Barriers to Cycling

- 2.6 Safety is the key issue that dissuades people from cycling and the Panel received evidence from Transport for London that 70% of concerns relate to this. The number of reported deaths of cyclists in collisions has reinforced this perception. Evidence from survey data also shows that women are more likely to feel that cycling is too dangerous than men.
- 2.7 Cycling in London has nevertheless never been safer according to statistics. Casualty rates are currently the lowest ever recorded. In 1989, 90 million cycle journeys were made in London, of which 33 ended in death. In 2015, 270 million cycle journeys were made in London, of which only 9 ended in death. This figure of 9 deaths was the second lowest on record in absolute terms and the lowest ever in per journey terms. Figures for serious injury show that 419 people were seriously injured in 2014, which is lower than the figure recorded for 1993 when less than half the number of journeys were made by bicycle.
- 2.8 However, a recent piece of research (the Near Miss Project) on near miss and other non-injury incidents involving cyclists showed that they are widespread in the UK and may have a substantial impact on cycling experience and uptake. **It concluded that “policy and research should initially target the most frightening types of incident, such as very close passes and incidents involving large vehicles. Further attention needs to be paid to the experiences of groups under-represented among cyclists, such as women making shorter trips.”** This underlines the need for a safe infrastructure so that people feel safe enough to cycle.
- 2.9 The Panel heard that a number of reasons have been given by Haringey residents in surveys as to why they do not cycle. These are as follows:
- Traffic volumes/danger from traffic;
 - Personal security whilst cycling;
 - Bike security;
 - Inadequate cycle parking – lack of/poorly installed/designed parking;
 - Cost of bikes and relevant equipment;
 - Lack of signage;
 - An overly sporty or competitive image;
 - Health issues – **people of below average fitness thinking “it’s not for me”;**
 - **From a motorists’ perspective, cycling looks more dangerous than it is;**
 - Car parking – danger and disruption; and
 - Permeability – disruption of direct cycle routes by one way systems etc.
- 2.10 In terms of overcoming barriers to cycling, the following issues were considered by residents as measures that would encourage more cycling:
- | | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| • Cycle lanes | 42% |
| • Cycle parking/storage | 20% |
| • Route information | 17% |
| • Training/equipment loans | 15% |
| • Nothing | 6% |

Benefits

2.11 There are strong and compelling reasons to promote cycling. A number of benefits are very much relevant to the needs of *all* residents and not just cyclists:

- Cycling reduces road congestion on the roads and it is the most space efficient form of transport. More cyclists mean fewer cars on the road and more space on buses and tubes;
- It has clear health benefits. Cycling is a form of exercise that is easily incorporated into a daily routine, especially if undertaken as part of the commute to work. Britain is facing a rapid growth in obesity and cycling can make a significant contribution to addressing this;
- Air pollution kills around 9,500 people per year in London. Reducing the number of car journeys by increasing cycling will help to reduce pollution. Cycling also causes very few CO2 emissions;
- It can assist in improving social inclusion by providing cheap, reliable access to jobs and facilities, especially for young adults;
- As part of overall general measures to reduce traffic and promoting living streets, it can play a role in making streets more pleasant environments for all;
- Cycling offers the least expensive means of travel in London;
- It is quick and convenient for short journeys; and
- It is easy to carry modest loads by cycle.

3. ACTION TO INCREASE CYCLING

- 3.1 Increasing the use of cycling as a mode of transport has been a priority for a large number of local authorities. The Panel visited Cambridge and the London Borough of Waltham Forest to see how they had successfully achieved considerable improvements and detailed notes of these are included in the two case studies within this report.
- 3.2 **London wide action to realise the Mayor's Vision for Cycling is being undertaken by Transport for London, in partnership with the boroughs.** The vast majority of funding for cycling projects comes from Transport for London, mainly from Local Implementation Plan (LIP) funding. This is money this is granted to London boroughs to spend on projects which support the Mayor's Transport Strategy. In addition, London boroughs are also taking action individually to increase cycling. **TfL are responsible for London's "red routes"** whilst all other roads are the responsibility of the London boroughs.
- 3.3 **The cycling budget for the Mayor's Office is £912 million over 10 years.** The table below sets out the historic annual expenditure, the draft budget for 2016/17 and business plan allocations for the remainder of the £912m ten year programme:

<u>Year</u>	<u>£m</u>	<u>Source</u>
2012/13 to 2015/16	302	Actual spend
2016/17	155	Draft budget
2017/18	166	Draft plan
2018/19	124	Draft plan
2019/20	66	Draft plan
2020/21	68	Draft plan
2021/22	31	Draft plan
Total	912	

- 3.4 **Cycling accounts for only 4 per cent of TfL's capital spending.** The £600 million that is currently being spent on just upgrading Bank Underground station is equivalent to two-thirds of the entire ten-year cycling budget. In addition, the budget is set to reduce in the forthcoming years but there is now a new Mayor and it may therefore be subject to review.
- 3.5 Spending is currently at its peak with £200 million currently being spent to develop the network. The Mayor decided to spend money on the development of a pan London network, particularly the super highways, to address concerns regarding safety. The super highways are already main cycle routes and are mainly segregated from other traffic. They are built to a high specification and allow cyclists to travel at a range of different speeds.

- 3.6 Funding of over £100m has also been allocated by TfL for radical transformations in three outer London boroughs – Enfield, Kingston and Waltham Forest - **as part of the “Mini-Holland” scheme. The aim of this is to encourage more people to cycle, more safely and more often while providing better streets and places for everyone.** The programme has specifically targeted people who make short car journeys in outer London that could be cycled easily instead. The Panel noted that Haringey had also made a bid for funding under the scheme but had not been successful and discussed with officer what lessons had been learnt.
- 3.7 In respect of London as a whole, the Panel heard evidence from Andrew Gilligan, the Mayor’s Cycling Commissioner and Mark Trevethan, Principal Strategy Planner at Transport for London. Mr Gilligan stated that the population in London was growing and there are now more people and less room. Cycling represented a quick and cheap way to increase the capacity of the transport network. Promoting cycling was not just about making improvements for cyclists - it was a quality of life issue. Improvements aimed at cyclists, for example those undertaken in Enfield and Waltham Forest, had the potential to make places more pleasant for all. More people cycling meant less people taking up road space, more available seats on buses, improved public health and less pollution.
- 3.8 The Panel noted that the demography of cyclists was starting to change. A recent attitude survey has shown that there are now only marginal differences with the BAME communities. However, there is still considerable resistance or lack of interest in some communities, particularly the Asian and Turkish communities where cycling is considered low in status. People from BAME communities are also more likely to be living in flats and therefore have difficulties in storing bikes. Progress also still needs to be made in increasing the number of women cyclists. This contrasts with the situation in Denmark and Holland where the majority of cyclists are women. Cycling in these countries is also considered to be a normal activity and not just for the elite few.
- 3.9 Mr Gilligan drew attention to the fact that improvements to the cycling infrastructure can be controversial and even modest proposals can provoke a disproportionate reaction from a minority of residents. This was acknowledged by Councillor Stuart McNamara, the Cabinet Member for Environment, who stated that it might be necessary at some stage to upset a few people in order to benefit many in order to develop cycling in the borough further.
- 3.10 He stated that political leadership in such situations was very important. A scheme in Palmers Green had prompted vociferous opposition but the results of consultation on the proposals had shown 60% in favour. Proposals were often controversial initially but people quickly forgot what the concerns had been. For example, a scheme in Railton Road near Herne Hill had been met with a lot of local opposition but many now felt that it had made the area a lot

more pleasant. Soft “**behavioural change**” measures had been undertaken by some local authorities to encourage cycling. These provided easy wins and were met with little opposition but would not ultimately be successful in developing cycling unless people felt safe to cycle.

- 3.11 He felt that trialling schemes was useful and possible where improvements were not on a large scale and did not include changes that were difficult to reverse, such ones that included the use of concrete. This approach had been successful in many places, especially New York. The forthcoming scheme that was being developed in Enfield was a trial and this had helped to overcome some local opposition. Not many boroughs were both willing and capable of taking on and implementing cycling developments effectively. Examples of boroughs that had been successful were Camden, Islington, Hackney, Southwark and Waltham Forest. The Mayor’s Office were happy to help assist with programmes and likely to have to become more involved in the future.
- 3.12 In relation to Haringey, Mr Gilligan stated that he would like there to be more cycle routes in the borough. It had a similar demographic to boroughs with far higher levels of cycling but the roads were not very cycle friendly. He expressed a particular interest in the development of an east-west route across the borough, from East Finchley through to Muswell Hill to Wood Green and Tottenham. This could be done but would require the political will to push it through. The Panel also noted the benefits that could come with regard to bringing people together. If there was a good local project, it might be possible to find the funding from TfL for it. In particular, he would support plans for bike hangars in areas where there were lots of houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) and limited places for people to leave their bikes.
- 3.13 Quietways are also being developed further by TfL in collaboration with the boroughs. These are aimed at overcoming barriers to cycling by targeting cyclists who want to use quieter, low-traffic routes, and providing an environment for those cyclists who want to travel at a gentler pace. They are not specifically segregated from other road traffic. Each Quietway is intended to provide a continuous route for cyclists and each London borough will benefit from the programme. This network will complement other cycling initiatives such as the Cycle Superhighways and the Mini-Hollands. The Panel noted that progress with these had been slow but they had been starting from a low level. In some boroughs, progress has been straightforward but in others a lot of development work had been required.
- 3.14 Mr Trevethan drew particular attention to the adoption of 20 mph speed limits in a number of boroughs which he felt had been helpful. A lot of roads are designed to allow fast speeds and a 20 mph speed limit helped as it meant that roads can be narrowed. Lower speeds can also play a role in making cyclists feel safer and encouraging people to take up cycling.

- 3.15 He felt that there were a number of things that individual boroughs could do to develop cycling further;
- Having a clear cycling strategy that spells out clearly how cycling can benefit the borough and the part that it plays in wider objectives such as health, tackling health inequalities, reducing pollution and planning;
 - Establishing a long term route network with clear priorities and using this as the base for the LIP programme and other projects, as well as the planning process;
 - Integrating other Council processes, especially planning and regeneration, and requiring developers to provide cycle facilities such as high quality parking plus prominent, convenient cycle access and links to the network;
 - Using of Section 106 agreements and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to invest in improved routes;
 - Considering the potential for new uses for streets in areas with low car ownership e.g. play streets, parklets and look to address complaints about rat running and traffic speeds so that projects are presented as not just for cyclists; and
 - Considering the potential for cycling in other Council programmes such as training for local unemployed people in cycle repairs, cycle training for young parents and cargo bike loan schemes.

4. HARINGEY'S STRATEGIC APPROACH

- 4.1 Increasing cycling has already been recognised as a priority for the borough **and is a key objective within the Council's Corporate Plan 2015-18**. The Panel heard evidence from officers regarding the vision for cycling in 2025;
- Cycle routes and facilities as good as the best in London;
 - An extensive network of safe and attractive cycling routes covering all corners of the borough;
 - High levels of cycling amongst residents from all backgrounds and communities;
 - Access to residential secure cycle parking;
 - Cycle training guaranteed for all residents;
 - Cycling considered a safe form of transport for everyday journeys for people of all ages; and
 - Cyclists and pedestrians will be able to use the road network safely.
- 4.2 Action to increase the level of cycling will be outlined in the **Council's** upcoming Cycling and Walking Strategy. This will be achieved by a combination of work aimed at improving the infrastructure and changing attitudes. Partnership working and political commitment are considered integral to achieving this.
- 4.3 The Panel received evidence from Councillor Stuart McNamara, the Cabinet Member for Environment, who gave his views on the **Council's** action to date. He felt that there was a lot that was good with what was currently being done to promote cycling but there were also some areas that could be improved. Some infrastructure projects had been implemented without prior consultation. A large amount of the previous infrastructure had also needed to be removed. However, improvements did not necessarily need to cost much and it was more about smart thinking.
- 4.4 The Panel noted the views of Haringey Cycling Campaign who did not feel that there had been much improvement in the last ten years. They also highlighted the need for political will in order for meaningful change to take place. In addition, they felt that while officers were sympathetic, they often did not see cycling as a priority.
- 4.5 The evidence that the Panel received indicated that a clear transformational vision for cycling is needed for the borough. However, it noted evidence from other local authorities that focussing solely on the needs of cyclists can alienate non cyclists. In response to this, Waltham Forest have now started **to promote their Mini Holland scheme initiatives under the "Walk, Cycle, Enjoy"** slogan. As previously mentioned, cycling can also have the benefit of improving the environment for all by making our streets safer, cleaner, quieter and more welcoming.
- 4.6 Boroughs that have been successful in increasing the level of cycling are supported by a strong political commitment. This needs to be demonstrated

in order to maximise funding opportunities as the evidence shows that TfL and other funders are more likely to provide support if they feel confident initiatives will be followed through and delivered. Initiatives to develop the infrastructure can sometimes be controversial and, in such circumstances, TfL will wish to be reassured that there is sufficient commitment locally to resolve any issues.

Recommendation:

That, as part of the forthcoming Cycling and Walking Strategy, a transformational vision for cycling be developed by the Council for the borough and promoted as part of a wider “Living Streets” strategy, encompassing both walking and cycling and backed up with strong and committed political will.

4.7 The overwhelming evidence is that safety is the single reason why most people do not cycle. Whilst to a certain extent this is based on perception rather than reality, large increases in the number of cyclists are unlikely to take place until people feel safe to cycle. For this to happen, there needs to be safe spaces for cycling. It is also clear that this is essential to reach a wider demographic, particularly women, older people and children.

4.8 Cycle routes should provide a safe, welcoming and attractive environment for cyclists. In such circumstances, people will be far more likely to choose to cycle. To achieve this, there are clear benefits in having segregated cycle lanes as they minimise interaction with road traffic which is a major barrier for many potential cyclists. They have been effective in promoting increases in cycling elsewhere and are particularly beneficial where speed differences between cycles and motor traffic are high or where traffic is heavy. The Panel received evidence that there are also a number of different options that can be used to provide segregation which can assist when space is at a premium. These include soft or light methods of segregation such as rugby ball shaped “armadillos”, the “Cambridge kerb” or planters.

Recommendation:

That the overriding priority of the cycling content of the Council’s forthcoming Cycling and Walking Strategy be to create a high quality cycle network that is, as far as possible, segregated from road traffic where speed differences between cycles and motor vehicles are large or where traffic volume is heavy.

4.9 The Panel noted that many boroughs have a dedicated cycling officer, including a number that had been very successful in increasing the number of people cycling, including Waltham Forest. At the moment, Haringey has a Smarter Travel Officer whose responsibilities include cycling and extra funding is received from TfL for this post. However, the post currently only deals with behaviour change and cycle training and not all cycling related projects and activities, such as development of the infrastructure. The Panel feels that the

establishment of a single post with responsibility for all aspects of cycling would assist in improving co-ordination of the development of cycling. This could also assist in helping to secure additional external funds, particularly from TfL.

Recommendation:

That, in order to promote and develop cycling in the borough further, a dedicated post of cycling officer be created, with an overarching responsibility for all aspects of the development of cycling within the borough.

4.10 The Panel is also of the view that there should be regular and ongoing engagement with the community and stakeholders on cycling issues so that their feedback can be systematically incorporated. It is particularly important that alterations on road layouts are consulted upon at an early stage so that they may be amended if necessary and regular meetings should provide an opportunity for such discussions to take place. This may reduce the risk of money being spent on developments that are poorly designed. In addition, the structure of the Transport Forum should be reviewed so that it encourages wider involvement of the community, particularly pedestrians and cyclists.

Recommendations:

- *That quarterly meetings regarding cycling issues be scheduled between relevant officers, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Haringey Cycling Campaign and linked into meetings of the Transport Forum; and*
- *That the structure of the Transport Forum be reviewed so that it encourages wider involvement of the community, particularly pedestrians and cyclists.*

4.11 The Panel noted the safety deficits of some of the existing cycle infrastructure in the borough. For example:

- On Mayes Road, the southbound cycle loan on the pavement leads to an increased risk in crossing Coburg Road;
- Crossing the Roundway to All Hallows Road potentially leads cyclists into the path of a fast moving vehicle turning left into the same road; and
- In several locations, the swing left and right onto a pavement cycle lane **takes cyclists' paths close to a sharp and unforgiving end to railings.**

Regeneration

4.12 The Panel received evidence on how cycling was taken into account in regeneration programmes. In Tottenham Hale, the new District Centre Framework would provide a high level master plan for developments. As part of this a Street and Spaces strategy, that included cycling had been developed and was currently being consulted on. Haringey Cycling Campaign had welcomed it but had stated that they would comment in due course on

the detail. Lessons have been learnt from the work undertaken around the Tottenham gyratory system and the aim is now to provide segregated cycling lanes wherever possible. One of the aims of the regeneration work is to make Tottenham a destination for people to meet and visit. As part of this, TfL is considering making Tottenham a Cycle Superhub.

- 4.13 Specific work is also being undertaken with Waltham Forest to open up the wetlands between Tottenham Hale, Tottenham Marshes, Blackhorse Road and Walthamstow. This would provide a segregated cycling route as well as access to the Lee Valley.

5. DEVELOPING HARINGEY'S CYCLING INFRASTRUCTURE

- 5.1 The Panel heard that there are a number of major TfL infrastructure projects that are currently being undertaken within the borough;
- Cycling Superhighway 1 will connect Tottenham to central London and is due to be completed in spring 2016. The Council is building an extension that will take it onto Northumberland Park
 - The second phase of the Quietway will pass through Bowes Park, Wood Green, Alexandra Palace, Finsbury Park and onto central London;
 - An electric bike hire scheme is being developed. The preferred bidder will be selected in January and the scheme implemented in Spring 2017. This is a fairly small scheme and will follow the route of the W7 bus from Finsbury Park to Muswell Hill. There will be 200 bikes.
- 5.2 In addition, the Council are undertaking the following:
- Permeability measures are being implemented to allow two way cycling on some one way streets and the removal of barriers to cycling;
 - Cycle routes are being developed in the Tottenham gyratory area; and
 - Identified priorities of Haringey Cycling Campaign are also being addressed.
- 5.3 A major scheme has also been undertaken in Wood Green that delivers cycle parking, advance stop lines and new cycle lanes. In addition, traditional streetscapes are being re-introduced as part of estate renewal and this will help to encourage cycling.
- 5.4 The local plan includes a Green Grid of cycling and walking routes which are intended to be long term initiatives where the Council wishes to focus investment. Whilst some of these will be funded through the LIP, the Council is also looking to obtain funding from other sources.
- 5.5 The Panel noted evidence from the Cabinet Member for Environment **regarding Haringey's bid for "Mini Holland" funding**. He was not unduly concerned by the fact that **the Council's** bid had been unsuccessful as he felt that there was an opportunity to learn from the neighbouring boroughs that had been successful.
- 5.6 From evidence received, it is clear that there needs to be a high level of preparedness by Council if it is to be in a position to take full advantage of funding opportunities, particularly from TfL. It is highly likely that further opportunities to obtain funding will arise and this might well include another mini Holland scheme. The Panel notes that there is already the outline of a long term route network within the Green Grid. It would nevertheless welcome further detail on the long term route network for the borough as well as clarity regarding priorities and is of the view that these should be clearly publicised within the Cycling and Walking strategy.
- 5.7 The Panel noted the current lack of an east-west cycle route across the **borough and the interest of the Mayor's Cycling Commissioner in developing**

one. Whilst some work is being undertaken by officers to develop an east-west route, current plans are only for a Quietway that goes part way across the borough. The Panel would therefore welcome the inclusion of a specific east-west route across the borough within the long term network.

Recommendations:

- *That the long term cycle route network for the borough and priorities within this be clearly publicised within the new Cycling and Walking strategy; and*
- *That the long term cycle route network includes provision for a specific east-west route that crosses the borough.*

5.8 In addition, the Panel noted evidence from a variety of sources of the benefits of trialling schemes as these provide flexibility to evaluate and amend schemes in response to the concerns of residents.

Recommendation:

That cycle infrastructure projects be piloted in the first instance wherever possible in order to allow them to be amended following concerns raised by residents.

5.9 The Panel obtained the views of Haringey Cycling Campaign on how the current cycling infrastructure could be improved. They highlighted the following issues:

- Some old cycle routes had been much neglected;
- Barriers to prevent motorcycles being driven along footpaths also had the effect of not allowing bicycles through;
- There were pinch points on some roads, including Albert Road, where it was too narrow for a bike and a vehicle to pass through together;
- The amount of parking allowed on some roads was unsuitable;
- Main roads and junctions could be challenging for cyclists;
- There were a number of large junctions that it was hoped could be improved for cyclists, including Wightman Road, Colney Hatch Lane and Lordship Lane. The rebuilding of the railway bridge of Wightman Road might provide a particular opportunity to do this;
- Bus stops were not always located well in their proximity to cycle routes. Other countries have **created “floating” bus stops**, which give room for cyclists to pass behind them;
- Some shared use paths were too narrow;
- 2-way cycling could be implemented easily on one way streets but a lack of forethought could lead to a waste of resources. Park Road in Hornsey was an example of a well laid out facility where the best possible options had been taken. Opportunities had been missed to incorporate initiatives into other schemes, such as Green Lanes. Implementation could be simple and need sometimes only required signage;
- A proposed bridge over New River next to the border with Hackney had encountered local opposition. It had been supported by Hackney Council

but opposed by Haringey some years ago and might be worthwhile revisiting;

- There was heavy competition for road space in some areas of the borough. In Wood Green High Road, this had been exacerbated by narrowing of the road. There were other options that could be explored and which could be considered as part of the Wood Green regeneration scheme;
- There were issues with signage in a number of locations, including by the Tottenham War Memorial where it was not clear where the cycle lane was located; and
- There were a large number of faded white lines. This was easy to resolve and brought big safety benefits as motorists were much more likely to comply.

5.10 Members of the Panel undertook a cycle tour of key parts of the borough with Council officers and members of Haringey Cycling Campaign. This enabled them to observe the infrastructure at first hand and experience what it is like to cycle within the borough. Whilst there are some good sections of cycle route, these tend to be short and disjointed. The better routes appeared to be in quieter side streets but could entail dismounting to cross main roads.

5.11 **The previously highlighted issue with “pinch points” was** encountered. These are sections of road where the carriageway is narrowed by design - often at traffic islands - with the intention of slowing and calming traffic. They can often be a source of risk to cyclists as anyone cycling in the inside of a lane is forced into the main flow of traffic by them. In addition, it was noted that some cycle routes were laid out so that they encouraged cyclists to ride too close to parked cars, which can put them at risk of being hit by opening car doors.

5.12 The Panel is of the view that the issue of cycle and bus pinch should be addressed as these can compromise the safety of cyclists. In addition, a scrutiny review on road safety in 2007 recommended that parking on corners should be prohibited. This recommendation was accepted but the Panel would request confirmation that this is still policy.

Recommendations:

- *That the Council’s Regeneration, Planning and Development Service undertake a review of cycle pinch points to ensure that these do not compromise the safety of cyclists; and*
- *That the Cabinet Member for Environment be requested to confirm that the Council’s policy remains that that parking on corners is prohibited and, if so, that it is enforced.*

5.13 The Panel noted that one of the strategies followed successfully in Cambridge, as well as other places, is to enhance accessibility for cyclists so that it is easier to travel on bicycle than by car. The overall strategy has been

described as “filtered permeability” and describes road design that still allows through access for walking and cycling but removes it for motor traffic. This can be achieved either by a straightforward physical closure with bollards or the use of opposed one-way streets with exemptions for cycling or simply by the use of signage. It is an important part of the strategy used to develop cycling in Holland and can be used to improve accessibility without the need for cycle paths. The Panel feels that increasing the number of exemptions for cyclists from one way restrictions would provide a useful and cost effective means of encouraging cycling further within Haringey.

- 5.14 The Panel would nevertheless like to ensure that this will not compromise the safety of pedestrians. It is possible that, when crossing one way streets, they may not think to look the other way for cyclists. Bicycles are also quiet, making it less likely that pedestrians will be alerted to their approach. It therefore feels that proposed exemptions should be signposted clearly and trialled in the first instance.

Recommendations:

That action be taken by the Regeneration, Planning and Development Service to increase the number of exemptions for cyclists from one way restrictions and that these be signposted clearly and trialled in the first instance in order to ensure that they do not compromise the safety of pedestrians.

- 5.15 The Panel received evidence that cycle paths with shared use with pedestrians can be a source of confusion. In particular, the Cabinet Member for Environment was of the view that the thinking behind these was flawed. The Panel would therefore welcome a review of their use.

- 5.16 The Panel also feels that methods of slowing cyclists that do not prevent the use of child or load trailers, tag-alongs or load carrying cycles should be investigated. For examples, Cambridge use low humps on the pedestrian side of some shared use paths. In addition, methods of deterring motorcycles and scooters that do not affect cyclists with child trailers are needed and experience from elsewhere should be incorporated.

Recommendation:

That the Regeneration, Planning and Development Service be requested to;
(a). Commission a review of cycle paths within the borough where there is shared use with pedestrians; and
(b). Investigate methods of slowing cycles and deterring motorcycles and scooters which do not impact on cyclists using trailers, child tag-a-long and cargo cycles.

- 5.17 The Panel is of the view that the most effective way of keeping abreast of issues in respect of the cycling infrastructure in the future would be for relevant officers to cycle around it. In addition, this could provide a useful

opportunity to engage with stakeholders.

Recommendation:

That an annual cycle ride around the cycling infrastructure be undertaken by relevant officers with representatives of Haringey Cycling Campaign and interested Councillors to determine any issues relating to it that require attention, particularly signage and repairs.

6. CYCLE PARKING AND SECURITY

- 6.1 Provision for parking bicycles is an essential part of developing cycling as a mode of transport as cyclists need somewhere safe and secure to leave their bicycles. Haringey has undertaken specific investment in cycle parking, which is now available in a wide range of locations across the borough and especially around public transport hubs. Some modes of parking are chargeable for users and there is therefore scope for them to be, at least, partially self funding
- 6.2 Cycle hangars have recently been introduced and have proven to be very popular. These are on-street covered facilities intended for the use of people in flats or houses in multiple occupation with little room to park bicycles. They cost £3,000 each and part funding is available for these. There is also a charge for residents who use them.
- 6.3 The Panel noted that views of the Cabinet Member for Environment, who felt that there were still a lot of gaps in the placement of cycle racks, such as near parks. He felt that this could be remedied fairly easily, subject to funding. The Panel would concur with this view.

Recommendations:

- *That strong support be given to a major expansion by the Council, working with Transport for London, of the number of bike hangars.*
- *That the Environment and Community Safety Service install additional bike racks where there genuine demand can be demonstrated.*

- 6.4 The Panel were impressed by the facilities in both Cambridge and Waltham Forest both in terms of the quantity of spaces and the high quality of them. There are currently 3,000 parking spaces for cycles at Cambridge station. There are 8 cycling hubs within Waltham Forest, which provide secure cycle parking around the clock for a charge of £10 per year. The locations include every tube and railway station and there are now over 1,000 parking spaces.

Recommendation:

That a feasibility study should be undertaken to see if secure and contained cycle parking facilities, similar to that provided by cycle hubs in Waltham Forest and part financed by a charge to users, could be established in Haringey.

- 6.5 The Panel noted evidence that **Council's Local Plan provides the** overall planning policy context for supporting cycling and sets out current cycle parking standards which are considered the minimum. The Council will follow London Plan cycle parking standards once they are finally approved.
- 6.6 Cycle parking is required to be safe, undercover and secure and "Sheffield"

type stands are typically installed within an undercover secure shelter. Cycle parking is promoted by requiring its inclusion in scheme designs and is one of the transport related considerations on whether a development proposal is acceptable.

- 6.7 In considering planning applications, the Council's **planning process seeks** to enhance sustainable transport. In terms of cycling, enhancements or additions are sought to the local cycle network. To mitigate the impact of a development on the highway network, the Council will typically seeking a contribution through the Section 106 process. The Panel noted that with higher levels of development of housing and jobs within the borough, there would be scope for managing the development of the cycle route network to ensure such measures are integrated within the design process.
- 6.8 One key issue in respect of cycle parking is security. The Panel received evidence from Sergeant Mick Doherty of the Metropolitan Police regarding this. It heard that the number of cycle thefts had increased from 663 in 2014 to 730 in 2015. People often bought expensive bikes without investing in security of the same quality to protect them. There are a number of hot spots within the borough which shift regularly. Seven Sisters, Wood Green, Turnpike Lane and Crouch End have all been hot spots. The Police were giving consideration to using cameras focussed on bike stands to address thefts. Haringey has one of the highest rates of theft in north London but the Panel noted thefts in central London were a lot higher.
- 6.9 Operation Pluto was set up to target cycle theft, using plain clothed officers and decoy bikes, as well as high visibility patrols. Bike registration is another useful deterrent. This can be done by the Police for no charge and enables bikes to be tracked. Halfords can also stencil bikes as part of the scheme and efforts are also being made to involve independent bike shops.
- 6.10 The Panel noted that cycle parking facilities can sometimes contain remnants of bicycles, particularly frames, and that they can remain there for some time. It is important that cycle parking facilities are attractive and well maintained. Bicycle parts should therefore be removed quickly and according to clear timescales.

Recommendation:

That clarification be provided on the procedure and responsibility for the removal of bicycle parts from cycle parking facilities and the timescale involved and that specific action be taken to speed up this process.

7. PROMOTING BEHAVIOUR CHANGE

- 7.1 The Council aims to achieve behaviour change through its Smarter Travel programme. This is intended to complement work that is being done to develop the infrastructure. It has the following aims:
- To improve cycling, active travel and health;
 - To reduce road casualties;
 - To reduce traffic and congestion; and
 - To improve air quality and reduce CO2 emissions.
- 7.2 The cycling element of this has promoted the following:
- Bikeability and balanceability training;
 - Cycle maintenance sessions and cycle security;
 - Awareness training for lorry and van drivers;
 - Tougher enforcement of HGVs;
 - Cycle facility improvements for schools;
 - Engagement and enforcement linked to the wider 20mph limit; and
 - Volunteer Cycle Rangers.
- 7.3 The following have been part of this programme:
- Smarter Travel information and advice road shows, including the Festival of Cycling;
 - Cycle rides for pupils – mass cycle rides during Bike Week;
 - Sky Rides for all and Breeze Rides for women;
 - Active Travel projects run by community organisations;
 - Personal travel planning project; and
 - The Haringey Cycling Conference, which took place in September 2015.
- 7.4 Panel Members attended the Haringey Cycling Conference and found it a very useful opportunity to learn from experiences elsewhere, share ideas and develop networks. They believe that it should be made into a regular event. However, it should be wider **than just cycling and include walking and “living streets” initiatives**, in line with the strategic approach.

Recommendation:

That Haringey Cycling Conference be made into a bi-annual event but with a wider focus, including walking and “living streets” initiatives.

- 7.5 The Panel received evidence on the impressive work that is being done by some schools in the borough. It heard from **Sarah O’Carroll from North Harringay School** on the work that has been done by the school to promote cycling. As part of a walking and cycling to school programme, the school had successfully applied for a grant of £5000 from the London Cycling Campaign. This had been used, amongst other things, to develop cycle training and purchase a number of bikes. School staff had been trained as cycle trainers and were now able to offer cycle training to children at the

school. Many of those who had been trained had been able to get other paid work as instructors.

- 7.6 They now have approximately eight qualified cycle instructors and, in addition to cycle training, are able to offer a bike recycling scheme and maintenance workshops. The school founded the Haringey Schools Cycling League and has also participated actively in Bike Week and arranged family bike rides had also been arranged. There are also pool bikes available for staff and a cycling after school club, which had been financed by a TfL cycle grant.
- 7.7 **Ms O'Carroll** stated that it would be possible for the training offered by the school to be extended to other schools within the borough. According to survey data, the overriding barrier to increasing the level of cycling cited by schools was concern about safety and this was a consistent pattern.
- 7.8 The Panel were very impressed by the work undertaken by North Haringay School. They feel that that a Haringey Cycling Charter for schools should be developed as a way of building and extending the work that had been undertaken by North Haringay School to include cycle training and facilities.

Recommendation:

That a Haringey Cycling Charter for schools should be developed as a way of building and extending the work that had been undertaken by North Haringay School and that this include cycle training and facilities.

- 7.9 The Panel noted the excellent work that has taken place with schools. This has been focussed on primary schools but is not specifically restricted to them. Additional funding was received from TfL this year to target secondary schools with cycle training but it has proven very difficult to engage with them in order to carry this out. The Panel would recommend that further efforts be made to engage with secondary schools and include them in cycle training.

Recommendation:

That further efforts be made to engage with secondary schools within the borough and include them in cycle training provided as part of the Smarter Travel programme.

Case Study 1 - Cambridge

The Panel visited Cambridge, which currently has the highest percentage of people cycling on any city in the UK.

- 30% of people in Cambridge cycle to work. 22% of all trips are made by cycle and the aim is to reach 40% by 2023. The gender split is 59% men and 41% women. There is also a mixture of ages.
- People feel safe to cycle and therefore do so. It is an easy way to travel. The **centre of Cambridge is not accessible by private car. “Rat runs” are also not accessible by car but can be used by cycles.** There are several streets which are no entry except for cyclists. Cycling therefore gives people access to a wider network of roads.
- Double yellow lines had been used in some places to prevent people from parking in cycle lanes. This had been controversial but there had been the political will by the Council to carry it through.
- Funding has come from a number of sources, including Section 106, DfT and City Deal funding. Whilst funding can be identified to develop the cycle infrastructure, maintenance is an issue as there is often a lack of funding.
- Action was taken to ensure that all developments encourage the use of sustainable transport. Section 106 agreements had been used to ensure that developers mitigated the growth in the quantity of traffic arising from developments.
- There are currently 3,000 covered parking spaces for cycles at Cambridge station. The planned new science park railway station would have space for 1,000 cycles.
- There was a cycling forum to discuss plans that includes local authorities, cycling organisations, Sustrans and local employers.
- There had been opposition to some schemes. However, work had been undertaken to engage with residents and develop relationships with them. A number of objectors to schemes cycled themselves and this made it easier to engage constructively with them.
- The **“Cambridge kerb” had been developed as a means of separating cycles from the main carriageway whilst allowing a car or cycle to safely cross the kerb.**
- Red aggregate is used for cycle lanes where possible as it kept its colour. However, it had to be ordered in large quantities.
- A number of schemes had been trialled in the first instance before becoming

permanent.

- The middle class demographic has been targeted, who were likely to be more sympathetic to cycling.
- There was a substantial cycling infrastructure, including cycle phases at traffic lights, “floating” bus stops, segregated lanes and (not visited) a cycle and pedestrian bridge over the River Cam.

Case Study 2 – Waltham Forest

The Panel also visited Waltham Forest, which was one of the three London boroughs that had been successful in bidding for “Mini Holland” funding.

- Waltham Forest had looked at the Mini Holland Scheme as a good opportunity. They had not been selected initially and were asked to reconsider bits of their scheme, particularly links to the north of the borough, before they were selected.
- They have a good track record of delivery and were well ahead of other mini Holland boroughs in delivering the scheme. There is a borough cycling officer.
- £30 million had been made available from TfL in total, as part of the scheme. There were also other cycling programmes that the borough was undertaking. These included Quietways, for which there was £600,000 as well as other linked LIP programmes.
- Walthamstow Village had been the first pilot, which had proven to be controversial, with vociferous opposition and support, as well as a silent majority who did not have strong views. Although the work had been controversial in nature, there were now no vacant shops there whereas there had been six a year ago. Estate agents were now specifically advertising properties in the area as being “close to the mini Holland scheme”.
- There had been considerable opposition to the schemes, including one of the **largest protests in the borough’s history**. There had been an unsuccessful High Court challenge. Opposition had calmed down after this.
- There are eight cycling hubs (see below) within the borough, which provide 24 hour secure cycle parking for a charge of £10 per year. The locations include every tube and railway station and there are no over 1,000 parking spaces. There are also currently 30 cycle hangars within the borough and it is planned to install another 30 this year. There had been an unexpectedly high level of demand for these. The possibility of installing single hangars in front gardens is being investigated. Additional cycle stands were also being installed – around 1,200.



- Promotional work is being undertaken that focusses on cycling and walking. The Council is trying to drop the “mini Holland” label and was currently using the slogan “Walk, Cycle, Enjoy”. Broadening the scope of promotional work helped widen its appeal as some people could feel disenfranchised by the focus on cycling. The work being undertaken was also of benefit for people who did not cycle.
- Work is done with schools and cycle training was available. Some work has also been undertaken with local mosques in order to increase cycling amongst all communities.
- The most important issue was ensuring that people felt safe to cycle.
- Various means of segregating cycles from cars had been used, including kerbs, armadillos and orcas, which they had found to be better than the Cambridge kerb because they were a more flexible installation.
- It was necessary to be proactive in order to gain maximum benefit from funding opportunities. TfL preferred to award funding to boroughs who had a track record of effective delivery. It was also important to demonstrate political commitment to carry out schemes. They currently had schemes that were ready to go when suitable funding became available.
- There was also a design guide that could be given to developers and identified the next steps that were being taken. The hope was that developers would buy into the vision.
- The targeted increases in cycling that had been set had been reached ahead of schedule. The Health Economic Assessment Tool (HEAT) had been used.

Appendix A

Participants in the Review:

Haringey Council;

Malcolm Smith, Team Leader in Transportation Planning, Planning Service

Denise Adolphe, Smarter Travel Manager (Communication and Consultation), Environment and Community Safety

Edward Richards and Peter O'Brien, Tottenham Regeneration Team, Haringey Council

Councillor Stuart McNamara, Cabinet Member for Environment

Councillor Toni Mallett, Council Cycling Champion

External;

Andrew Gilligan, **Mayor's Commissioner for Cycling**

Adam Coffman, Haringey Cycling Campaign

Michael Poteliakhoff, Haringey Cycling Campaign

Sarah O'Carroll, North Haringay School

Sergeant Mick Doherty, Metropolitan Police

Mark Trevethan, Principal Strategy Planner, Transport for London

Clare Rankin, Cycling and Walking Officer, Cambridge City Council

Bala Valavan, Head of Highways, London Borough of Waltham Forest

Chris Procter, Mini Holland Design Manager, London Borough of Waltham Forest

Mark Bland, Mini Holland Programme Manager, London Borough of Waltham Forest