

Issues arising from the previous meeting of the Cycling Liaison Group on 24th October 2011

1. LIP2

What is the current status of the Second Local Implementation Plan for Transport, and the related Cycling Strategy?

What are the implications for the Delivery Plan [**LIP2 page 56, Annex H**] and the associated spend, given several schemes were to be completed by the end of the current financial year with an allocated budget of £2.1 million?

2. Consultation

Cycling Policy 22 of the Draft Cycling Strategy says:

“The Council will ensure that its programme of cycling improvements, and highway schemes generally, are undertaken in regular consultation with local cyclists and organisations.”

[p42, para. 7.27]

At the end of November RCC submitted comments on three highway engineering schemes at Terrace Yard in Petersham, Stanley Road in Teddington and Hanworth Road in Whitton. All three schemes were identified by RCC members reading the Council’s Weekly Digest. None were sent to RCC for comment, even though the proposed works at Stanley Road included significant narrowing of the carriageway that would affect people who cycle. How does LBRuT propose to consult on the impact of planned highway engineering on people who cycle in the Borough, given the invitation to attend the Traffic Management Liaison Group was withdrawn in September?

3. Cycle Collisions

The Draft Cycling Strategy says:

“The CLG has an important role to play in helping to identify future priorities”

[p42, para 7.29]

How can the CLG ensure the clearly identifiable clusters of collisions in Richmond, Teddington and Twickenham town centres are included in the programme of works for the next financial year?

4. Cycling on Footpaths

What has been decided about the list of footpaths RCC submitted to allow cycling where it is currently prohibited?

What has been decided about the suggestion to adopt the elevated footway in The Terrace using section 65 Highways Act 1980 which says:

“a highway authority may, in or by the side of a made-up carriageway, construct a cycle track as part of the highway.”

Will LBRuT agree Considerate Cycling as the default position rather than No Cycling?

5. No Entry

What plans does LBRuT have to allow cyclists to ride against No Entry signs by adding “Except Cycles” as allowed by the Department for Transport following the [expressed intention](#) of Central Government to streamline Traffic Regulation Orders?

6. Cycling Scheme Programme 2011/12

This is outstanding from Item 7 Minutes of CLG on 5th September asking what the current status of each scheme, how much money has been spent, what remains to be spent in the current financial year and the impact on the programme for 2012/13

7. Any other Business

RCC gives CLG members notice of the LCC campaign for the London Assembly Elections “Go Dutch – clear space for cyclists on London’s main roads”. The campaign includes “10 Principles” and 3 tests of the Mayor’s commitment to safe and convenient cycling in London. Quoting from a recent article in London Cyclist:

“One of the fundamental differences between Dutch and British practice is that there they begin by considering the needs of pedestrians and cyclists whenever they design or renew street infrastructure. As a result they make pleasant and calmed streets where possible, yet choose to provide separated facilities for cyclists where necessary on main roads.”

“Another difference is that street layouts and traffic law usually give priority to cyclists over motor traffic in urban areas.”