

Active Travel Advisory Group

Tuesday, 17th November

17:00 – 19:00

Virtual Meeting

Attendees

Cllr Gareth Richards (chair)	Active Travel Champion
Cllr Alex Ehmann	Chair of the Transport and Air Quality Committee
Cllr Katie Mansfield	Deputy Chair of the Transport and Air Quality Committee
Nick O'Donnell	Assistant Director Highways and Engineering, Richmond Council
David Tidley	Transport Strategy Manager, Richmond Council
Margo Turner	Principal Transport Planner, Richmond Council
Cllr Monica Saunders	20's Plenty, MASC
Raphael Zachary-Younger	Barnes Community Association, Sustrans
Tim Lennon	Richmond Cycling Campaign
Paul Luton	Cycling UK
James Heath	Richmond Cycling Campaign, Teddington Society
Jenine Langrish	MASC
Justine Langford	Ham & Petersham Neighbourhood Forum
Brian Holder	Teddington Society
Alan Benson	Transport for All, RUILS
Rob Gray	FORCE
Brian Sztukowski	Living Streets
Victor Warner	Richmond Cycling Campaign
Joan Gibson	Friends of Heathfield Athletic Ground

Meeting notes

1.	Welcome and introductions	Cllr Richards
	Cllr Richards welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made	
2.	Update on London Streetspace Plan Phase 1 Projects	
	<p>Margo and Nick provided a quick overview of the schemes that have gone in as part of Phase 1 of the LSP. Namely, these schemes are Kew Road, Castelnau, Hampton Court Road, Burton's Road, School Streets and various town centre improvements.</p> <p>Following the overview, the group was asked for feedback on the schemes and the potential for converting the schemes from temporary to permanent. Paul and Jenine both commented that while the new facilities were welcome (particularly the cycling schemes), they seemed to end somewhat abruptly and 'launch' people back into general</p>	

	<p>traffic. Cllr Ehmman noted the difficulty in undertaking this work in a rapidly changing political landscape with official advice changing quickly over time, concluding that getting in these schemes, even if not completely joined up, is an achievement and helps normalise the schemes and we should be able to improve and grow them in the future. Nick added that in many cases the permanent schemes would look a bit different to the temporary schemes, as the temporary schemes were restricted by timescales and budgets. Raphael requested some changes to the Castlenau scheme, to be follow up with Nick.</p> <p>It was noted that there has been some conflicting feedback on the Kew Road scheme, some of it focusing on a lack of consultation but there is scope for this to be resolved going forward.</p> <p>There was some discussion on consultation methods and informal consultation, with a push for the Council to undertake more innovative methods of consultation and to make better use of new technology to improve engagement.</p> <p><i>Post-meeting update:</i></p> <p><i>Hampton Court Road: Longer terms plans are for a shared footway facility between the roundabout and the Park removing the measures off the highway onto Palace land where there is space available. This is obviously subject to Palace approval and consultation/funding.</i></p> <p><i>Kew Road: Funding for Phase 2 of Kew Road has been sought through the LSP tranche 2 funding. The detail design and consultation is already complete and a report already drafted for signature. This phase of the scheme will provide scheme continuation from Lion Gate Gardens to Richmond Circus. Further north we are in discussion with TfL about how the scheme links in with their proposals on the red route and across the bridge linking with Cycleway 9/Chiswick High Road. It has been confirmed by TfL that Kew Road has been shortlisted for LSP 2 funding.</i></p> <p><i>Castelnau: There was a need to maintain sufficient road width, at least 3m running lanes plus a suitable width for the bus lane. This did result in slightly reduced widths on the southbound cycle lane. The wand/orca arrangements was</i></p>	
--	--	--

	<p><i>omitted from areas where the width was not sufficiently wide. We will monitor this issue.</i></p>	
3.	School Streets	
	<p>Margo provided a summary of the borough’s School Streets: there are now 14 School Streets in operation, with 5 signage only and the rest manned by volunteers (although some are a bit ad hoc). Plans are to improve on existing school streets before introducing and additional schools, to include the introduction of camera enforcement to reduce reliance on volunteers. It was noted that many of those attending ATAG also act as volunteers, which is very much appreciated by the Council.</p> <p>After the overview, feedback was welcomed from the group. Overall there was positive feedback, with recommendations for improved parking enforcement and it was noted that speed has increased in some areas where there is less congestion. Tim suggested the Council look at way to gather feedback and promote the positive impacts that the schemes are having.</p>	
4.	Future programme	
	<p>Margo went through the list of future funding – 20/21 LIP, LSP2, Climate Change Fund and Capital Programme – providing a quick glimpse of the projects that we have bid for and our priorities for the next five months. Margo also provided a summary of the pedestrian crossing study and proposed next steps. The study includes details on all formal and informal crossings within the borough, mapping their locations, and an assessment of the crossing against a wide range of criteria.</p> <p>There was then a wider discussion about the need for new crossings versus improving existing crossings, and the scope for more information gathering on where local people would like crossings, i.e. using an online engagement tool akin to Commonplace. There was some discussion on the risk of raising expectations in terms of the installation of new crossings, as they can be very expensive and may not always be found to be the best solution for a particular road.</p> <p>Brian asked for a review of the signal timings at Manor Road/ Ferry Road junction, and Nick said the Council would add it to</p>	<p>NOD to add Manor Road/ Ferry Road</p>

	the boroughs request list for TfL to review (noting that the programme currently has a considerable backlog so there may be a delay).	junction to request list for TfL to review
5	AOB	
	<p>Tim asked about formalising the meetings further so that meetings are listed more formally on the Richmond Council website, with formal minutes and papers.</p> <p>Cllr Ehmann asked the group about whether or not they would support the borough participating in an e-scooter trial, with general support. Alan mentioned that the companies taking part in the trials, i.e. Lime, have been quick to respond to concerns/problems raised, and that a trial would be broadly welcomed.</p> <p>There was some discussion on the need for cycle maps for the borough. It was reiterated that it is not currently a priority for officer time, but the RCC may look at developing their own maps.</p> <p>Jenine asked if people could provide feedback on the following list and for suggestions for additional local businesses to add to the list– a new online guide to sustainable living in the borough – http://www.greenrichmond.org.uk/active-travel/</p> <p>Cllr Saunders asked if we could consider a branding exercise for consultations and projects, such as ‘Greener Richmond’ or ‘Active Travel Richmond’.</p> <p>It was requested that the dates for all 2021 meeting be published as soon as possible.</p>	MT to liaise with Democratic Services regarding options for formality
	<p>Suggested dates for meetings in 2021:</p> <p>Tuesday, 2nd February, 17:00 (virtual meeting)</p> <p>Tuesday, 27th April, 17:00 (virtual meeting)</p> <p>Tuesday, 6th July (TBC)</p> <p>Tuesday, 5th October (TBC)</p>	