



City of Westminster

# City of Westminster Cycle Superhighway 11 Workshop 6 The Hub, Regent's Park

Attended by:

- [Redacted], Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Parking, City of Westminster (HA)
- [Redacted], City Transport Advisor, City of Westminster (ML)
- [Redacted], Project and Programme Manager, City of Westminster (JR)
- [Redacted], Project Support Officer, City of Westminster (AS)
- [Redacted], Senior Sponsor, TfL (KB)
- [Redacted], Portfolio Sponsor, TfL (LG)
- [Redacted], Service Development Manager, FM Conway (AK)
- [Redacted], Senior Engineer, The London Borough of Camden, (DT)
- [Redacted], Marylebone Association (PN)
- [Redacted], Chief Executive, Crown Estate Paving Commission (MJ)
- [Redacted], Project Manager, ZSL London Zoo (RF)
- [Redacted], Head of Landscape, The Royal Parks Agency (RH)
- [Redacted], Cycling Touring Club, CTC (PB)
- [Redacted], Westminster Living Streets and representing The Camden Cycling Campaign and Westminster Cyclists (PH)
- [Redacted], Regent's Park Cyclists (JM)
- [Redacted], Regent's Park Cyclists (CD)
- [Redacted], Park Manager, The Regent's Park (NB)
- [Redacted], Cycle Programme Engagement Officer, The Royal Parks Agency (ES)
- [Redacted], Friends of Regent's Park, Primrose Hill (CM)
- [Redacted], St Marylebone Society (GH)
- [Redacted], Treasurer, St. John's Wood Society (RL)

Apologies:

- [Redacted], Ward Member, Marylebone High Street, City of Westminster
- [Redacted], Ward Member, West End, City of Westminster
- [Redacted], St John's Wood Society, Chairman
- [Redacted], Director of Parks and Deputy Chief Executive, The Royal Parks
- [Redacted], Traffic Free Regent's Park
- [Redacted], Westminster Group of London Cycling Campaign
- [Redacted], Regent's Park Cyclists
- [Redacted], Park Village and Environs Resident's Association (Secretary)
- [Redacted], Camden Town and Primrose Hill
- [Redacted], Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Transport and Planning, London Borough of Camden

<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Cycle Superhighway 11 – Workshop 6</b>
<b>Date:</b>	<b>25<sup>th</sup> February 2016, 17:30</b>
	<p>ML – Chairing the meeting. Introductions. ML – Set the scene of what stakeholder engagement has happened to date.</p> <p>LG – Gave context of cycling in London and current issues facing cyclists. Explained Mayor of London cycling Vision.</p> <p>KB – Ran through presentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Gave overview of proposals.</li> <li>- <b>Swiss Cottage gyratory</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Finchley Road (College Crescent banned turns into and out of)</li> <li>o Finchley Road (Hillgrove Road banned turns in)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

- **Avenue Road (Camden Junction)**
  - o Queen's Grove point closure. Residents dispute that the junction is dangerous.
- **Avenue Road (Westminster Junction)**  
Mandatory cycle lane, Double Yellow Lines, Green Man signals at Prince Albert Road.
- **The Regent's Park**  
Need to reduce speed and volume of traffic. Access restrictions at four gates to discourage through traffic. Heritage of the park to be maintained; raised tables proposed to indicate when entering a different environment. Looking at safety cameras, looking at speed signage.
- **Portland Place**
  - o Two options. First option, advisory cycle lanes. Second option, floating the parking to provide protection.
  - o Also new signalised pedestrian crossings at junctions.
- Journey time impacts
- **Next Steps: Consultation closes on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2016.**

LG – Gave overview of the traffic impacts and explained traffic reassignment modelling and localised VISSIM modelling. Also explained ATM and gave examples of roads which will potentially see increased and decreased flows. Traffic is likely to reassign more to the east of the park than the west. Presented the journey time impacts summary table.

KB – Outlined that the consultation has been running for three weeks. 810 responses have been received to date.

CM – How many responses do you require to alter course?

KB – TfL will consider all responses.

KB – Outlined the next steps. Detailed design in Summer 2016, Construction in 2017.

LG – Recapped the focus of concerns from the meeting on Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> February.

- o Concerns about traffic reassignment.
- o Design of facilities in the Outer Circle.

ML – Confirmed CB's suggestion to make Avenue Road within the Swiss Cottage Gyratory to two-way flow. Main concerns raised were about the High Speed 2 construction traffic and the St. John's Barracks construction impacts. TfL confirmed that the modelling has not included these two schemes.

PN – Confirmed no northbound traffic modelling (including Portland Place). How can respondents make informed decisions if modelling data is not available?

AU - Confirmed Baker Street and the West End project is included in the CS11 strategic modelling.

GH – Can you please clarify if York Gate will be closed? Will traffic head east to north via Balcombe Street. How many extra vehicles will use Balcombe Street? Is this published on the TfL website? Balcombe Street is the only right turn available if York Gate is closed. Monday night no traffic modelling data and none again tonight. The Marylebone Society and the Marylebone Association cannot make informed responses without the data. Not showing data makes community suspicious.

RL – Concerned with this option and we need the reasons why this information is being withheld.

LG – Traffic modelling gives an indication and TfL's policy is to publish journey time impacts.

HA – Remember that traffic modelling is only modelling and only gives an indication.

ML – Concern from residents is that they need the information to make an informed response. Gave an example of transparency of releasing data and strategy of traffic reduction at Parliament Square.

GH – Stakeholders have been working with TfL and partners for nearly 18 months and are concerned about the basic level of information being presented.

JM – Key element is restriction of north to south and south to north rat-running through The Regent's Park. The response to the concern was not well handled. TfL should have explained ATM.

RL – Reiterated the concerns of the Saint John's Wood Society. Understands cycling initiatives means tradeoffs in road space. The principle issue is that all users co-exist already without any issues. Cannot see the case to restrict motor traffic. Plans presented seem to be symbolic and vindictive on motorists. The case to protect cyclists has not been made.

NB – Raised the issue of traffic speeds in The Outer Circle.

RL – If the issue is speed then we need to deal with that, not restrict traffic.

KB – Outlined the heritage concerns in The Regent's Park and asked Max Jack to clarify.

MJ – The distinction between park roads and other roads. The Regent's Park is the premier green space in London. It is the most important piece of urban development that has ever happened in London. To divide up road space on The Outer Circle is not desirable for the heritage reasons. This is a park, not a road and it is approached from this perspective.

RL – The case for exclusion of through traffic has not been made.

PH – Portland Place. Camden and Westminster London Cycling Campaign groups support segregation. With car parking being retained, cannot widen cycle tracks. Living Streets oppose raised platforms within The Outer Circle. They are dangerous and unnecessary for the vulnerable road users. The Outer Circle Action Group would like to see The Regent's Park closed to all through traffic. We are prepared to accept a compromise of only closing four gates, but concerned that the proposals already watered down with gates open from 11 – 3. WCC, CCC, LS would like permanent closure of the gates. He has used The Regent's Park all of his life for recreation, it is a park and that is its primary function.

GH – The Saint Marylebone Society would agree with a lot of PH's points.

PB – Are there any proposals to have average speed cameras? Proposed cobbles at the raised table are not a good idea at the leading edge as they become loose and they have a tendency to be slippery. Are journey's local or longer distance journeys; has this information been collected?

AK – Queried the choice of materials for the junction treatments.

NB – Responded that The Regent's Park are looking for materials that are flat and textured.

PH – What is the justification for them.

GH – Consensus in the previous Regent's Park meeting on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of December was preference for treatment similar to Birdcage Walk. Has there been a design change from tarmac to cobbles?

NB – Trying to accommodate significant change of use without a significant landscape change. The fundamental issue regarding safety.

MJ – A whole range of users want to use the confined spaces as people enter the park. How can we make these spaces shared to enable users to safely coexist? The minimal intention is to create idea of shared space. Not intended to disadvantage any vulnerable road users.

NB – A strong, visible marker at the approach to the entry points is really important. We appreciate the concerns with regard to granite setts.

GH – The visual marker is the traffic signals. What would the table add? The problem with cobbles is it gives pedestrians a false sense of right of way and creates ambiguity.

MJ – Ambiguity and uncertainty is exactly what The Regent's Park is trying to create.

CD – I understand ambiguity concept, but three of the four locations have traffic lights.

NB – That is not correct. One is a signalised junction and two have pedestrian crossings nearby.

GH – Ambiguity makes the space less safe than having signalised junctions or crossings.

NB – The Regent's Park are presenting raised platforms to best meet the requirements of all the road users and considers safety and heritage.

JM – We compromised 14 down to four raised platforms. We had understood setts weren't being considered. Sports cyclists want to support CS11, but don't support

	<p>cobbled ramps.</p> <p>ES - The Regent's Park is still considering design and materials to be used on the platforms and The Regent's Park will create a mock ramp.</p> <p>CD - The misunderstanding has led to uncertainty over design of the ramps, yet the consultation form is structured to ask for support or not and this is a mandatory field.</p> <p>GH - The consultation shows the material is setts.</p> <p>LG - This is only a suggested material.</p> <p>PH - If pedestrians, cyclists and disabled interest groups, representing thousands of park users, say they don't want provisions for raised tables will they be dropped?</p> <p>NB - The Regent's Park is listening and will consider responses. The Regent's Park will not make a decision in isolation.</p> <p>GH - Will a tarmac example be mocked up?</p> <p>ES - Two options will be presented. One side will show skid resistant surface, the other side will show granite cobbles.</p> <p>GH - Will there be a mockup of an example like birdcage Walk?</p> <p>ES - The Regent's Park cannot commit to this.</p> <p>ML - Rather than spending money on mockups, why can't photos of good practices be taken?</p> <p>NB - The Regent's Park has not found an appropriate example.</p> <p>ML - Whose decision is it?</p> <p>MJ - The final proposals will be need to be agreed by all parties.</p> <p>PB - Where will mockup be?</p> <p>ES - In a parking bay in The Regent's Park.</p> <p>PB - What factors have The Regent's Park considered when deciding the Birdcage Walk example is not appropriate?</p> <p>NB - Width, speed, volume of traffic, patterns of use.</p> <p>ML - Birdcage Walk generally has good compliance with 30 mph speed limit, yet in The Regent's Park we need to address the identified issue with speeding vehicles.</p> <p>JM - All parties in the workshops and meetings have expressed that they are not supportive.</p> <p>KB - The consultation has options with free text boxes to allow support.</p> <p>CD - Sports cyclists are concerned about a lack of design and materials information. Only free text box to enter views on materials and design.</p> <p>GH - Represents 600 people and is fielding concerns about materials choice and design and is finding it very difficult to respond with the lack of information available.</p> <p>MJ - Valid issues are being raised, but do we want to lose the scheme over this issue of materials on the raised tables. The views around this table do not necessarily represent a consensus view of the community.</p> <p>JM - If you want support for CS 11 you need to tell us that that raised tables will be in tarmac.</p> <p>ES - The Design is not set, we are in consultation.</p> <p>RF - Proposals being discussed are for a highways finish. There are more solutions than tarmac, for example, resin concrete. Does TfL have data for effectiveness of other shared space solutions, i.e. Exhibition Road?</p> <p>JM - I am trying to understand at what point and how do we influence the decision. I think the safest option is for sports cyclists to oppose the scheme.</p> <p>CM - Have you considered raised platforms on roads leading to The Outer Circle and not on The Outer Circle itself?</p> <p>NB - The concept is to present different space as you enter the park and having them outside wouldn't fulfill this function.</p> <p>ML - Closed meeting and notified attendees of meeting on the 7<sup>th</sup> of March.</p>	